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The Intelligence Community Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity office (IC EEOD) commissioned this report to conduct an in-depth examination of barriers pertaining to hiring, retention, and career development of women, minorities, and persons with disabilities in the IC. This report builds upon extensive prior data analysis and reporting conducted annually within the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) and across the IC. Utilizing external resources for neutrality and objectivity, employees were given the opportunity to speak candidly and share individual perspectives on diversity and inclusion— inclusion being the glue that ultimately allows diversity to stick.1 This report also examines underrepresented groups’ concerns in the workplace through the lens of an extensive literature review, with the goal of determining why these issues continue to exist despite numerous attempts to break them down.

Diversity and inclusion efforts present deeply rooted and complex problems that have been the subject of concern by the IC for many years. The IC has recognized the importance of having a diverse workforce – both to ensure that it performs at its best and to ensure that it maintains the confidence of the American people. Yet despite varied and on-going efforts to address diversity concerns, the data shows disparities and challenges for many groups still persist. According to the Intelligence Community’s 2015 Annual Demographics Report, minorities made up 24.6% of the IC workforce in fiscal year 2015, a 1.4 percentage points increase since 2011. By comparison, in 2011, minorities made up 30.0% of the Civilian Labor Force (CLF) and by 2014, had made a gain of 2.5 percentage points to 32.5%. Employees with disabilities represented 7.9% of the IC workforce, up from 5.3% five years ago. However, by 2015, persons with disabilities were employed in the CLF at a rate of 17.5%. And the number of women at IC agencies has remained practically unchanged — 38.5% of the workforce compared with 38.6% in 2011 In contrast, the number of women in the CLF was 46.0% in 2011 and increased slightly to 46.1% by 2014.2 These statistics demonstrate that despite significant effort, there has been limited improvement, and many of the IC’s workforce challenges persist.

This study is unique in two ways. First, the fact that it sought to look across the entire IC as an integrated entity makes it the first of its kind. Although this study presents quantitative and qualitative results from various modes of data throughout the report, the findings and recommendations are based on a synthesis of results from all the data modes. Thus, although information gathered about individual IC elements was used as representative examples of certain practices or results relevant to the discussion, the findings treat the IC as a single unit of analysis. Second, that it was entirely performed by outside consultants gives it neutrality, and within that unique neutral space, employees spoke candidly about their personal struggles with inclusion. Research shows that inclusion is the essential ingredient for diversity to have an impact. The U.S. Office of Personnel Management defines inclusion as a “set of behaviors (culture) that encourages employees to feel valued for their unique qualities and experience a sense of belonging.”3 Studies by Deloitte University Press (2014), the Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM, 2010) and McKinsey (2014) demonstrate that there is common acceptance in research that diversity for diversity’s sake is simply an exercise in analysis of numbers. Without a sense of inclusion, the fact that a
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workforce may approximate representation of the population does not translate into value for the organization in terms of mission outcomes and impact. Thus, without the perception of a fair and inclusive work environment, essential gains derived from a diverse workforce are diminished and an organization risks employee apathy, disengagement, and attrition.4

The case for diversity and inclusion is clear. Along with an inclusive work environment, diversity in both leadership and the workforce are critical to maximizing mission effectiveness and impact. Given its national security mission, there is no more important place to encourage and support a culture of diversity and inclusion than in today's Intelligence Community. As the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) affirms,5 the intelligence effort is only strengthened by the presence of diversity and inclusion to attract and retain the type of employee who is most qualified for acting in the defense of this nation. The value of increasing diversity, especially in underrepresented segments such as minority groups, women and persons with disabilities, expands the talent base and more accurately reflects analytic capabilities necessary to evaluate and meet mission requirements.6 Indeed, one of the main goals stated by the DNI in Leading Intelligence Integration is to “promote a diverse, highly-skilled intelligence workforce that reflects the strength of America.”7

Although there has been a great deal of research on the sources of workplace inequality, there has been little on the effectiveness of different programs for countering it. Research has shown that, at best, “best practices” are “best guesses.”8 As one noted researcher observed, “We know a lot about the disease of workplace inequality, but not much about the cure.”9 A challenge is often then issued from leadership, that “What we have been doing has not been effective and we need to do something different.” This study takes a somewhat different approach from a traditional barrier analysis. Generally a barrier analysis involves the identification of anomalies found in workplace policies, procedures, practices, and conditions through a heavy reliance on workforce data tables and comparisons to other data sets (e.g., civilian labor force). While other data sources such as workforce surveys and employee input from agency employee and advocacy groups are employed, the emphasis is generally on comparing numerical data tables. This study shifted emphasis toward a more workforce-impact focused methodology complimented by a strong literature review addressing what empirical research has identified. This study strove to allow members of the IC workforce to be comfortable in commenting on issues they are unlikely to say directly to supervisors or managers and, in some cases, even avoid reporting to EEOD offices, or to Ombudsmen. Frequently, direct quotes are presented in this report to illustrate problem areas from the perspective of workforce members. The personal stories of the employees who make up the IC were heard. Some success stories were conveyed, but more often individuals expressed frustration at what are pervasively perceived as inequalities in the workplace environment.

IC employees are committed. Firm, deeply-embedded commitment was heard time and again throughout virtually every aspect of this study – from the numerous interviews conducted, to the many focus groups
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4 Riordan, C., “Diversity is Useless without Inclusivity”.
organized across all grade levels and demographics. During these sessions, the emphasis was not only on obtaining information regarding perceived barriers, but in actively listening to the participants to ensure that they felt heard and would thus be more open to sharing their thoughts. In addition, this approach oriented this report more toward the workforce members rather than numerical data. By exploring the emotional impact on employees, the research team could better understand not just the existence of potential workplace barriers, most of which had been identified multiple times in the past, but the actual impact on the attitudes or perception of employees, and through this process assist agencies in better understanding the full impact of these issues on the IC’s work climate. Thus, this study looked at work climate factors that are expressly adverse to diversity, as well as whether differences in the ways that various demographic groups perceive the work climate might be impacting diversity improvement efforts. Perception is an essential component of an inclusive environment which, in turn, is the other side of the coin to diversity.

The findings of this report revealed a series of themes of perceived barriers to diversity in the IC with respect to women, minorities and persons with disabilities. These themes focused on structural/organizational and policy concerns, issues in workplace and environmental attitudes and perceptions, and physical impediments that still exist within some areas of the IC. These findings give important insight into how culture and diversity relate to one another: the more different a person is from the traditional group of power in an organization, the more likely that person is to experience cultural distance or separation from the dominant ways of operating within that organization. This cultural separation often leads to both the perception and the reality of barriers experienced by people of minority demographics, and it increases in workplaces where there is strong pressure to assimilate to the existing dominant cultural norms, such as those often found within the IC. In instances where this study was unable to determine whether this negative perception corresponds to real inequities in practice or policy, the study finds that the perception in and of itself is relevant to the IC. Two primary themes underscore many of the findings of this report – the lack of diversity in leadership ranks and the lack of transparency in employment practices – which contribute to these perceptions of different treatment and experiences commonly held by employees of minority demographic groups in the IC.

This study highlighted six major areas where the IC can take an integrated approach to reduce or eliminate workplace challenges to hiring and retaining a more diverse workforce. The following six variables were defined as key to assessing the state of diversity in today’s IC environment. Within these six variables, specific associated points, or subcategories, narrow discussion to the most relevant topics for the IC as a whole. These variables and subcategories include:

- **Leadership**
  - Diversity Optics
  - Leadership Skills
  - EEO/Diversity Leadership Practices

- **Organizational Culture/Work Environment**
  - Workplace Diversity
  - Perceptions of “Tokens and Quotas” – Racial and Gender Stereotypes
  - Hierarchical Structures

- **Recruitment and Selection**
  - Need for Diversity in Recruiting Sources
  - Need for Cultural Sensitivities in Recruiting

- **Advancement**
  - Promotion/Opportunities
  - Mentoring
In all, this study had 36 separate findings and recommendations. The following is a concise consolidation of the findings focusing on six primary themes and recommendations. These summary consolidated themes are broken out into individual elements with extensive details and descriptions in the Findings and Recommendations chapters of this report, and are further summarized in tabular form in Appendix A.

FINDINGS

1. Leadership - Minority demographic representation in leadership positions is lacking. Seeing role models from minority demographics in senior leadership would be powerful and inspiring; the lack of these role models leads minority employees to question an agency or element’s commitment to diversity. Worse, perceptions of “token” promotions or appointments only serve to confirm negative stereotypes and alienate employees.

2. Organizational Culture/Work Environment - Despite strong messages promoting diversity at the most senior levels of the IC, middle managers and supervisors are often unsuccessful in promoting a diverse and inclusive workplace culture. Mid-level managers are commonly viewed as lacking empathy for non-majority cultural experiences and often avoid addressing poor performance and workplace inequalities. Well-intentioned programs suffer from poor-image problems due to narrow views if associated solely with “equal employment opportunity” and “diversity”.

3. Recruitment and Selection - In recent years, hiring and selection decisions have increased the incoming talent pool of women, minorities and persons with disabilities. However, the IC struggles to provide the type of inclusive workplace culture to retain these populations in the leadership pipeline, eventually leading to less representation at the most senior levels.

4. Advancement - Minority-demographic groups perceive unfairness across a number of employment practices, particularly promotion and advancement opportunities. There is a common concern that impenetrable majority groups limit minorities’ access to premium job assignments, mentoring and performance feedback.

5. Work/Life Integration - Many employees across the IC struggle with work-family conflict, and do not find supervisor support for the flexibility needed to manage their personal requirements. Issues with work/life integration seem to be systemic process issues that affect all employees within the community; however, these issues may be experienced more heavily by underrepresented groups, such as women, who more often have primary caregiver responsibilities.10

6. Disabilities and Reasonable Accommodations Existing disability-training initiatives are well-intentioned and well-received, but they are only part of the whole and, alone, they are insufficient in better informing the workforce and do not create long-lasting behavioral changes. There is a perception of widespread inconsistency in how reasonable accommodations are handled across the
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IC, and there is a lack of transparency throughout the request process. These problems may lead to a belief that the employee accommodation needs are unimportant and hence the employees with disabilities themselves are not valued.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on these findings, and supported by recent research, the following overarching recommendations are presented for consideration. Each recommendation maps to at least one of the findings; some cross over several of the key findings areas.

Recommendation One: (Leadership) Promote diversity and inclusion at the highest levels of leadership, and empower managers and employees at all levels to take responsibility and ownership for the diversity health of the organization. Diversity must be promoted at all levels. Encourage leaders to engage managers and employees at all levels in solving the problem, enabling them to make real change. Instead of defaulting to compliance-driven diversity tactics, engage managers and employees in the process of creating a more diverse and inclusive organization, by increasing engagements with employees who are from groups whose representation in the workforce is less than expected given comparative demographics, and tapping into opportunities for peer-level accountability. Go beyond important tools such as unconscious bias training and invest in a comprehensive leadership program including management empathy training that promotes awareness, encourages cooperation, and approaches diversity challenges with a more forthright, open tone.

Recommendation Two: (Organizational Culture) Use already-available management tools to increase diversity at all levels, without branding such effort as a ‘diversity initiative’. Some of the most effective tools are not strictly diversity initiatives. Encourage the use of management practices such as self-managed teams (i.e., having people in different roles or functions work together on projects as equals) and cross-training (i.e., rotating employees through different specialties to increase contact with diverse groups), especially within agencies that still have large components with predominantly majority group composition. Work side-by-side toward common goals to break down stereotypes. These types of management tools are shown to have more positive effects than traditional diversity initiatives on impacting real change to workplace cultures.11

Diversity programs should have a clear link to mission and impact on driving innovation and improving mission outcomes. Adjust key job titles, offices, and practices accordingly (e.g. Chief of Diversity and Innovation). Framing EEO and Diversity in terms of mission-workforce realignment and equity is increasingly being used by academic institutions, military branches, and top employers to rebrand the functional area, leaving room for organizational change.12

Recommendation Three: (Recruiting) Make long-term investments in relationship-building that is necessary to foster trust with certain demographic groups. Establish strategic diversity recruitment programs by investing in key relationships with target universities and/or diverse organizations. Improve diversity analytics and data reporting capabilities throughout the recruiting and selection process for more informed sourcing. Involve more diverse staff in recruiting and selection functions. Consider software programs that allow for blind resumes or blind interviewing, which help sidestep the risk of biased hiring decisions.

Recommendation Four (Advancement): Increase exposure opportunities by providing active mentorship opportunities, where there is professional investment by the mentor in the mentee, and shadowing programs that connect employees from traditionally underrepresented groups with other members of the workforce, focused on core mission. Identify ways – such as formal and informal active mentoring programs, shadowing initiatives, and participation in Employee Resource Groups – to nurture diverse employees through the career advancement pipeline in preparation to eventually become senior leaders. Circulate internal-advancement opportunities more widely, and encourage transparency in the selection process. Avoid the perception of “tokenism” in promotions and appointments.

Recommendation Five: (Work/Life) Consider options to increase paid family leave, providing employees the flexibility needed to manage times of work-family conflict. Within the limitations inherent with working in the IC, explore ways to design job flexibility. Encourage supervisor and management support for employees requiring flexibility in balancing their personal requirements, and focus efforts on long-term employee retention instead of short-term absence.

Recommendation Six: (Disability) Increase transparency and address perceived inconsistencies in the reasonable accommodations process. Continue to educate the workforce about disability issues – both visible and invisible. As with all employment practices, transparency in assignments, promotions and other career-advancement processes allow underrepresented groups to better understand the workplace environment and better prepare and compete for key assignments. Define a more-structured process across the IC to coordinate reasonable accommodations for employees moving from one agency or element to another.

Diversity and inclusion initiatives must be strongly supported by research, implemented carefully, and then evaluated to ascertain their effectiveness. Research studies have shown that, too often, leaders implement aggressive, ineffective diversity policies based on face validity or “common sense,” rather than empirical research. Not only do these initiatives fail to make organizations fairer for underrepresented groups, they risk alienating a substantial portion of the workforce—generally mid-level managers, who have the position and responsibility to make real and lasting change.

IC leaders should consider taking a multi-pronged approach to making changes to existing diversity and inclusion policies. Leaders should continue to raise awareness of barriers in the workplace, ideally with empathy training combined with unconscious bias training, which presents a non-accusatory explanation of how the brain processes information, which can result in negative biases. Ideally training should not be weighed down by negative rhetoric that only serves to activate bias or spark backlash. Empathy training may be a positive way to encourage managers and employees to be conscious of and understand the concerns and frustrations of others. Leaders should also seek to increase employees’ exposure to qualified managers and employees of diverse backgrounds, thereby positively impacting the way people think about those different groups and eroding currently-held stereotypes and unconscious biases. Research shows that exposure to diversity can positively impact the way people think about different groups.

Leaders can take action to increase exposure and modify the way they see others different from themselves by providing activities such as: highlighting positive, diverse role models in positions of
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leadership; getting involved with employee resource groups; implementing formal mentorship and shadowing programs; and more. Finally, leaders should encourage social accountability, rather than forced compliance, as a means of mitigating bias and improving diversity and inclusion. Social accountability encourages the use of such methods as diversity task forces comprised of volunteers and invitees from management and members of underrepresented groups.\textsuperscript{16} These peer-group task forces investigate potential barriers and come up with their own solutions. Instead of force-feeding policies, management and employees are actively engaged in improving their work environment.

Each individual IC agency or element must define the approach that best addresses these findings within their own, unique workplace culture. How the IC as a whole addresses this study’s findings is crucial to improving both the perception and the reality of workplace barriers. This type of change will take extraordinarily strong leadership, and in turn will require focused implementation strategies from the individual IC element for any substantial results to occur. As in any organization, the leadership of each element plays a vital role in setting the tone of the work climate. Leadership’s example must be mirrored by the individual managers and supervisors within each respective IC element who are in the most critical positions to impact culture. The actions and behaviors of middle-management are crucial to implementing successful change initiatives.

The IC can achieve success in diversity and inclusion by treating the process as an enterprise change initiative linked to other critical mission priorities. Diversity is not about counting people, but rather embedding diversity into every organizational process creating, in effect, a culture of inclusion\textsuperscript{17}—from talent acquisition, to workforce development, to leadership planning, and more. It means engaging the entire workforce and ensuring involvement of senior leadership. As Wasserman et al. (2008) noted in regard to the importance of leaders in creating an organizational culture of inclusion, “leaders establish a meta-narrative, or story, that supports the culture of inclusion and actively engages resistance to diversity efforts.”\textsuperscript{18} If handled effectively, diversity and inclusion will be less about checking boxes and more about making the IC a dynamic and agile force capable of meeting the national security demands of an increasingly complex interconnected world.

\textsuperscript{16} Dobbin and Kalev, “Why Diversity Programs Fail.”
This section provides a brief summary of the history of the IC’s workplace diversity and inclusion problems in the context of an extensive literature review. It also provides background for the report and includes a discussion of the circumstances leading to the report’s commission.

Diversity Matters

The case for diversity in the IC cannot be understated. We are living in an increasingly complex and interconnected world in which “unpredictable instability” is the new normal. Both at home and abroad, the U.S. faces such diverse national security threats as terrorism, cyber-attacks, drug trafficking, political instability, nuclear proliferation, disease outbreaks, space competition, and much, much more. Countering such diverse threats requires a creative and dynamic IC capable of collecting and providing nuanced, multidisciplinary intelligence to law and policymakers, military personnel, and law enforcement officials in order to successfully protect American lives and interests around the world. Indeed, one of the Director of National Intelligence’s (DNI) stated objectives is to “promote a diverse, highly-skilled intelligence workforce that reflects the strength of America.”

Decades of research reveal the significant benefits of a diverse and inclusive work environment. Committing to diversity and inclusion isn’t just the right thing to do; it is linked to measurable improvements in business performance. Socially diverse groups encourage the search for new information and fresh perspectives and are therefore more innovative and creative than homogeneous groups. Teams of mixed genders, ethnicities, physical abilities, and ages offer a wider variety of viewpoints and a broader range of experience, ultimately improving team decision-making and problem solving. In fact, simply being exposed to diversity can change how individuals think. Corporate America is catching on. With research increasingly demonstrating that diverse companies outperform their more homogeneous

Because of our mission, we . . . need a workforce that is truly global in perspective, one that can understand the subtle cultural nuances and complexities of ethnic and linguistic groups and subgroups to deal effectively (and sometimes clandestinely) with people from all of the various countries and cultures of the world.

ODNI Report on the U.S. Intelligence Community’s Five Year Strategic Human Capital Plan, 2006

20 Clapper, “Worldwide Threat Assessment.”
adversaries, competition for diverse talent has become fierce. Already, the IC is finding it difficult to keep up with private companies, many of whom can offer higher salaries and a less burdensome screening process.

IC Diversity and Inclusion Efforts

The IC recognizes the importance of diversity and inclusion. From the publication of the 2004 Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act (IRTPA) which stated that the United States must enhance its foreign interests through “greater tolerance and respect for religious and cultural diversity” to the 2006 establishment of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) IC Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Office (IC EEOD), to the DNI’s most recent statements calling diversity “mission critical” at the 2016 Annual Women’s Summit, it is clear that the IC views diversity and inclusion as mission-essential elements. In recent years, the IC has worked to identify and promote employment practices designed to attract, retain, and develop a diverse workforce. These efforts are detailed extensively in ODNI’s FY 2015 Annual Demographic Report on the Hiring and Retention of Minorities, Women, and Persons with Disabilities in the U.S. IC and include such initiatives as providing undergraduate training programs for disadvantaged students; developing and strengthening employee resource groups; implementing implicit bias training; and more.

Unfortunately, these efforts have resulted in only marginal improvements in the IC diversity environment. The FY2015 Demographic Report indicates that the number of minorities in the IC has increased by only 1.4 percentage points since 2011, and the number of women has remained practically unchanged. Hispanics and African-American males are particularly underrepresented compared to other benchmarks. For example, African-American males accounted for only 3.9% of FBI employees in 2014, compared to Caucasian males, who accounted for 46.8%. Moreover, women and minorities remain especially underrepresented at the most senior levels of IC leadership. The statistical charts following this section demonstrate that despite significant effort, persistent workplace challenges continue to hinder underrepresented demographics.

Within the IC, as in many organizations, subtle biases in the workplace related to demographics have often been reported which make actual work experiences very different for underrepresented groups. Data collected during the study also confirms the persistence of biases in the IC: interviewees and focus group participants spoke of subtle biases in the workplace that can make the work environment very different for people depending on their gender, race identity, or disability status. Previous industry research and prior IC studies have found a series of work climate factors that tend to create both the perception and the reality of barriers for certain demographic groups. These commonly seen trends in workplace bias are summarized by Russ Long in his work on social norms, conformity, and racial
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inequality.\textsuperscript{31} His study describes these commonly seen biases according to their impact on cultural minority groups. For example:

- Members of the cultural majority group sometimes get more mentoring or mentoring from more powerful people than do members of cultural minority groups.
- Members of the cultural majority group are sometimes more likely to be assigned to projects that have higher visibility at the top of the organization than do members of cultural minority groups.
- Members of the cultural majority group sometimes receive more helping behaviors such as co-workers volunteering to explain how to do something without being asked than do members of cultural minority groups.
- Members of the cultural majority group sometimes have more control over more resources (e.g., staff, budget, etc.) than do members of cultural minority groups of the same job grade.
- Members of the cultural majority group are sometimes more readily given stretch assignments such as being promoted to higher-profile jobs than do members of cultural minority groups.
- Because members of the cultural majority group often benefit from these biases, members of the cultural minority groups sometimes perceive a less positive work climate such as less inclusion, fewer opportunities to demonstrate expertise, and more negative performance feedback.

The Equal Employment and Opportunity Commission (EEOC) requires that federal agencies conduct annual examinations of demographic data in order to identify any barriers that disproportionately burden identified groups.\textsuperscript{32} EEO Management Directive 715 (MD-715) defines a “barrier” as “an agency policy, principle, practice or condition that limits or tends to limit employment opportunities for members of a particular gender, race or ethnic background or for an individual (or individuals) based on disability status.”\textsuperscript{33} When the data indicates that potential barriers exist, agencies need to conduct further inquiry in order to identify and examine the factors behind them. A number of agencies within the IC have taken proactive steps toward identifying and analyzing barriers specific to their organization. However, this report represents the first IC-wide study to look at causes or issues impacting diversity and inclusion, and how different demographic groups within the workplace perceive these issues.

**Why Diversity Efforts Fail**

An extensive review of applicable research and literature reveals that traditional diversity efforts are failing. In private industry, large companies have been doubling down on the same approaches to diversity they have used for decades without success. Instead of improving diversity and inclusion, these programs have done little more than protect organizations from litigation. One problem is that executives generally favor a classic “command-and-control” approach to diversity, with mandatory initiatives that are remedial in nature and cloaked in negative rhetoric—tactics that tend to trigger bias rather than eliminate it. Such a coercive approach breeds resentment amongst managers, who end up feeling “blamed and shamed” for their organization’s diversity shortcomings.\textsuperscript{34} Ultimately, this may cause them to resist, rather than support diversity efforts. Moreover, research also suggests that aggressive diversity initiatives do little to convince minorities that companies will treat them fairly.\textsuperscript{35}


\textsuperscript{33} EEO MD-715.

\textsuperscript{34} Dobbin and Kalev, “Why Diversity Programs Fail.”

Company grievance procedures are also problematic. Research shows that formal grievance systems do little to improve diversity and inclusion at large firms, and may actually be counterproductive. Rather than address allegations of discrimination, many managers instead disparage or retaliate against complaining employees. In fact, 45% of complaints lodged with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in 2015 included a charge of retaliation. Research further shows that employees are less likely to report bad behavior in their organization if they believe the grievance system doesn’t work; this, in turn, leads managers to mistakenly conclude that their firm doesn’t have a problem. Further, grievance systems may convince managers that company policies will guarantee fairness, allowing bias to creep into their decisions.

Many of the failing diversity and inclusion initiatives favored in private industry have also been implemented in the IC. Data collected for this report affirms these programs’ shortcomings. Persistent workplace challenges continue to exist for women, minorities, and persons with disabilities in the IC. Unfortunately, the IC’s aggressive efforts to improve diversity and inclusion are not having their intended effects. IC leaders should consider replacing existing policies with tactics that have consistently achieved positive results. This report suggests some of those alternative solutions in its findings and recommendations section.

Moving Forward

Diversity initiatives must be strongly supported by research and implemented carefully. Research studies have shown that, too often, leaders implement aggressive, ineffective diversity policies based on face validity or “common sense,” rather than empirical research. Not only do these initiatives fail to make organizations fairer for underrepresented groups, they alienate a substantial portion of the workforce—generally, those who have the power to make real change.

IC leaders should consider taking a multi-pronged approach when making changes to existing diversity and inclusion policies. Leaders should continue to raise awareness of barriers in the workplace, as is being done with Unconscious Bias Training which presents a non-accusatory explanation of how the brain processes information which can result in negative biases. Ideally, this type of training isn’t weighed down by negative rhetoric that only serves to activate bias or spark backlash. As discussed in subsequent sections, empathy training may be a positive way to encourage managers and employees to be conscious of and understand the concerns and frustrations of others. Leaders should also seek to increase employees’ exposure to qualified managers and employees of diverse backgrounds. Exposure to diversity can positively impact the way people think. Leaders can take action to increase exposure by providing positive, diverse role models in positions of leadership, by getting involved with employee resource groups, implementing formal mentorship programs, and engaging in shadowing programs. Finally, leaders should encourage social accountability, rather than forced compliance, as a means of mitigating bias and improving diversity and inclusion. Social accountability encourages the use of diversity task forces comprised of volunteers and invitees from management and members of underrepresented groups. These peer-group task forces investigate barriers and come up with their own solutions. Instead of force-feeding policies, management and employees are actively engaged in improving their work environment.

---

37 Dobbin and Kalev, “Why Diversity Programs Fail.”
38 Dover, et al., “Diversity Policies Rarely Make Companies Fairer.”
40 Phillips, “How Diversity Makes Us Smarter.”
41 Dobbin and Kalev, “Why Diversity Programs Fail.”
Like other successful organizations, each of the 17 elements of the IC can achieve success in diversity and inclusion by treating the process as an enterprise change initiative linked to other critical mission priorities. Diversity isn’t about counting people, but rather embedding diversity and inclusion into every organizational process, creating, in effect, a culture of inclusion— from talent acquisition, to workforce development, to leadership planning. It means engaging the entire workforce and ensuring involvement of senior leadership. As Wasserman et al. (2008) noted in regard to the importance of leaders in creating an organizational culture of inclusion, “leaders establish a meta-narrative, or story, that supports the culture of inclusion….” Wasserman et al. (2008) goes on to say that leaders must also listen to the story(s) of others who are resistant and engage with the other’s story to understand what is actually behind the resistance rather than to simply argue about it. If handled effectively, diversity will be less about demographic trends, and more about making the IC a dynamic and agile force capable of meeting the national security demands of a more global and interconnected world.

The following charts, Figures 1 through 5, were generated using statistics provided in ODNI’s FY 2015 Annual Demographic Report on the Hiring and Retention of Minorities, Women, and Persons with Disabilities in the United States Intelligence Community.

---

42 Shore, et al., “Inclusion and Diversity in Work Groups”.
43 Wasserman, I. et al., “Leadership Challenges in Fostering a Culture of Inclusion”.

---
Figure 2. Five-Year Female Representation Trends (FY 2011 to FY 2015)

Figure 3. Five-Year Persons with Disabilities Representation Trends (FY 2011 to FY 2015)
For purposes of visual clarity, the following two charts have adjusted the y-axis to a scale of 0-20% rather than 0-100%.

![Minority Representation among Managers by Pay Grade Group (FY 2015)](image1)

*Figure 4. Minority Representation among Managers by Pay Grade Group (FY 2015)*

![Female Representation among Managers by Pay Grade Group (FY 2015)](image2)

*Figure 5. Female Representation among Managers by Pay Grade Group (FY 2015)*
METHODOLOGY

This section provides an overview of the methodology that was developed to structure and focus the project’s data collection and analysis. See Appendix B for additional detailed information on the project methodology.

Scope of Report

The core question initially in the study design was: “What are the barriers to improving recruitment, advancement and retention among underrepresented groups within the Intelligence Community?” This became refined to look beyond the statistical metrics comparing demographic groups, and to examine the causes or issues impacting diversity and inclusion and how different demographic groups within the workplace perceive these issues. As Figure 6 below shows, the methodology for answering this question envisioned a three-phase approach, beginning with a focused analysis of the diversity and inclusion concerns within ODNI, then expanding to the six largest intelligence agencies (“Six Agencies”), and ultimately, to the extent possible, analyzing what workforce challenges exist at the remaining 10 IC elements. Although this study presents quantitative and qualitative results from various modes of data throughout the report, the findings and recommendations are based on a synthesis of results from all the data modes. Thus, information gathered about individual IC elements was used as representative examples of certain practices or results relevant to the discussion, and the findings treat the IC as a single unit of analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Intelligence Community Agencies and Elements Included in this Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Phase II | Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)  
Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)  
Federal Bureau of Investigation’s National Security Branch (FBI)  
National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA)  
National Reconnaissance Office (NRO)  
National Security Agency (NSA) |
| Phase III | Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence  
Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Office of Intelligence and Analysis  
Department of State, Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR)  
Department of Treasury (UST), Office of Intelligence and Analysis  
Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), Office of National Security  
U.S. Air Force (USAF)  
U.S. Army (USA)  
U.S. Coast Guard (USCG)  
U.S. Marine Corps (USMC)  
U.S. Navy (USN) |

Figure 6. Intelligence Community Agencies and Elements Included in this Study
This study ran from August 2015 to August 2016. The research and analysis approach involved with this study contained several elements including:

- Collecting and analyzing relevant IC demographic data reports;
- Conducting a thorough literature review;
- Identifying key areas for analytic focus;
- Adapting an organizational model for the study;
- Undertaking narrative data collection through interviews with senior leaders and focus groups with employees;
- Analyzing the resulting information; and
- Producing findings and recommendations.

Quantitative data collection. The internal review included IC-wide and agency-specific studies (see Appendix G for a full summary of IC and agency-specific studies and reports reviewed). As Figure 7 below shows, this quantitative data analysis involved five years (FY2009 – FY2014) of relevant demographic reports, as well as look-ahead strategic Human Capital, EEO, Diversity and Inclusion, and Enterprise planning reports. During the course of this study, the IC EEOD released and made available its annual composite report of demographics across the IC for FY15. Where applicable, these most recent findings have been incorporated and notated accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intelligence Community Reports Collected and Analyzed44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD-715 reports and accompanying data tables, 2009 – 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report on Hiring and Retention of Minority Employees in the Intelligence Community, 2009 – 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Reports on EEO Complaints Processing in the Intelligence Community (EEO 462 reports), 2009 – 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Employment Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP reports), 2009 – 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence Community Climate Survey Reports45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence Community EEO and Diversity Strategic Plan 2007 – 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence Community EEO and Diversity Enterprise Strategy 2015 – 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence Community Human Capital Vision 2020 and Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Agency or Component Studies on Women, Minorities, or Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A National Security Imperative for the IC (DSAPIC 2004 Report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Agency or Component Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plans (2009-2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Planning Progress Report – FY 2010 Report on Plans to Increase Diversity within the IC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Intelligence Community Reports Requested, Collected and Analyzed

Literature review. A comprehensive literature review of relevant articles framed the IC-specific findings into appropriate context in relation to other external agencies and organizations. The literature review focused on recent professional and scholarly analyses of various challenges to workforce diversity and workplace inclusion (see Appendix H for a bibliography of sources reviewed). To reflect the rapidly evolving understanding of workplace diversity issues experienced just not in the IC but across the federal

44 This list is representative of the types of reports requested. Not every IC agency or IC element produced every one of these reports. For example, some elements are not required to produce FEORP reports.
45 Only 3-5 survey questions related to EEO topics for ODNI were included.
government and private industry, this literature review was not limited to just the early stages of the project. Rather, as new and relevant research became available, it was reviewed and incorporated on an on-going basis throughout the course of the project.

Identification of key themes for analytic focus. Building on these studies and reports, key themes were identified for further exploration. These involved:

- **Institutional and Structural Programs and Policies** – including diversity, advancement and recruiting programs; qualitative analysis of programs and resources;
- **Biases, Attitudes and Perceptions** – including data collection samplings of volunteers from the workforce through focus groups and interviews to identify perceptions, relationships, biases, awareness, commitment and culture; and
- **Physical Barriers Identification and Recommendations** – including issues related to reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities.

Development of analytic model. Descriptive models from organizational development were used to create an analytic framework for assessing the data collected. Organizational factors from two identified models most relevant to analyzing workforce diversity were integrated to maximize the analysis of available data. As the data analysis progressed, this integrated model was further adapted to highlight six major areas where the IC can take an integrated approach to improving the promotion and retention of a diverse workforce. These variables include: **Leadership, Organizational Culture/Work Environment, Recruitment and Selection, Advancement, Work/Life Integration, and Persons with Disabilities.**

Qualitative data collection activities. Other sources were then used to collect qualitative, narrative, anecdotal information and individual insights on workplace diversity. The most extensive of these sources were focus groups with employees and interviews with key senior leaders. In summary, these qualitative data collection activities included the following:

Notifications to agency leaders. Through close coordination with the IC Diversity Council, notification letters were sent out to EEO and Diversity leaders in all IC elements. Leaders were asked for their support and contributions to the report in several ways. They were invited to participate in interviews, and to recommend other senior leaders within their IC element to participate in interviews. Leaders were also asked to notify their workforce of the opportunity to participate in focus groups. (See Appendix E for the notification letter sent to agency leaders.) Feedback was sought to encourage an open dialogue between leaders and the project team.

Notifications to the workforce. Once Leaders within each IC agency or element were notified, they were asked to distribute a separate notification to their workforce, describing the project and encouraging participation in the focus groups. A total of 442 volunteers came forward across IC elements to participate in this study. Of this total, 7% were ODNI volunteers for participation in the ODNI-specific Phase I portion of the project. The majority of volunteers, 83%, were employees from the Big Six Intelligence agencies, while an additional 10% volunteered to participate from the other IC elements. Figure 8 shows the breakdown of total volunteers across IC agencies and elements.

---

46 Weisbord’s “Six Box Model” was adapted to examine the data from a larger systems perspective, along with McKinsey’s “Seven S Model,” a value-based management model that describes how to holistically and effectively define large organizations. See Appendix B for a more detailed description of the adaptation process of these models.

47 Data collection relied heavily on the IC elements’ points of contact, who were managers designated by each element to facilitate the study’s data collection within that element.

48 In Phase III, DHS, US Navy and US Air Force were the only IC elements to provide volunteers for focus groups.
Senior interviews. A total of 39 senior leaders from all participating IC agencies and elements were interviewed, to include Agency leadership, Human Capital (HC) Directors, and EEO Directors49. A semi-structured interview questioning format was used, based on the research topic areas (see Appendix F for a list of the questions used). The open-ended nature of the questions defined the topic under investigation, but also provided opportunities for both interviewer and interviewee to discuss some topics in greater detail. The questions were useful for collecting attitudinal information in a manner that was well suited for this type of exploratory research.

Of the total interviewees, the Phase I ODNI-specific interviews comprised 23%; Phase II Big Six Agencies comprised 49%; and Phase III Other IC elements comprised 29%. Of the total interviewees, 41% were male, and 59% were female, and 8% of interviewees self-identified with a disability. Figure 9 illustrates the demographic break down of the interviewees by self-identified minority group.

49 Some interviewees, though not seniors, held key internal leadership positions in ERGs, or had specific experience relevant to diversity or disability issues.
Attendance at Employee Resource Group (ERG) meetings. To gain further insight into specific demographic groups, e.g., Hispanics, the study team attended ERG meetings and held informal discussions with small groups of employees. These sessions provided additional insight into some of the collective issues faced by and shared among particular segments of the workforce.

Focus groups. A key element in the data collection approach, over 100 employees participated in focus groups averaging eight participants each to provide valuable workplace insights. The focus group model was utilized to encourage group interaction, dialogue, and debate among participants. Each focus group was conducted at an off-site location and steps were taken to ensure anonymity. Participants were divided into focus groups based on grade level: GS12 and below or GS13 to GS15. Efforts were made to ensure that employees participating in the focus groups reflected the makeup of various demographic groups that were the focus of this study. Of the total volunteers for this project, approximately one-fourth were able to attend the focus groups.

Of the total focus group participants, 31% were male, and 69% were female. A relatively substantial proportion, 29%, of focus group participants self-identified with a disability. Figure 10 illustrates the demographic break down of the focus group participants by self-identified minority group. Due to limited volunteerism at the GS12 and below level, only 15% of focus group participants were GS12 and below; 85% were at the GS13 to 15 level.
Voluntary nature of participation and anonymity. Focus group participation was completely voluntary and subject to several factors including day-of-event scheduling conflicts, inclement weather, and having sufficient numbers of volunteers at each participating IC element. In addition, it became apparent that a fear of adverse repercussions from participating in this study was very real for many volunteers. Anonymity of participants was essential given the sensitivity of the subject. In all instances, responses were categorized or “coded” to remove details that might point to a specific individual. In this way, no personally identifiable information was captured on individuals who participated in the study, consistent with the project’s commitment to ensuring the individual identity of employee participants would not be disclosed. When quotes were believed to be potentially identifiable, they were approved by the speaker, modified by the speaker, or listed as non-attributed. Some quotes were edited for clarity. In addition, the study also protected the confidentiality of individuals’ participation, subject to the limitations of some elements’ requirement to involve HR or EEO administrators and/or supervisors in participant notification and selection.

Self-selected nature of participation. This study was not compulsory, and thus, participation was inherently self-selected. That is, input was only obtained from individuals who chose to provide it. Further, it is a tenet of human behavior research that self-selected participants may not give representative results. At the very least, in studies involving self-selection, it is likely that only individuals with more emphatic opinions participate if everyone is given an equal chance to participate. In addition, individuals with emphatic opinions of a certain nature – either particularly negative opinions or particularly positive opinions – are likely to participate. Respondent self-selection can impact any study; in this study, several measures to limit its impact were incorporated such as the inclusion of a broad base of opinions; skillful moderation with a well-defined agenda; and the inclusion of a variety of data collection modes.

---

This study reported perceptions of workplace biases and challenges, and did not review or investigate each element’s actual workforce practices—such as hiring boards in recruiting or reasonable accommodation requests in EEOD offices. Thus this qualitative data collection contains the perceptions of the individuals who have experienced these practices first-hand and who participated in the focus groups.

**Demographic representation in focus groups.** Some minority groups were less represented in the focus groups despite diligent efforts. This could be attributed to many factors: the desire to hide certain personal aspects in the workplace, trust issues, schedule conflicts, lack of ability to attend during work hours given job requirements, or a belief that no change would come from it.\(^51\) Indeed, a common complaint heard from employees who participated in focus groups was that there had been previous focus groups and interviews held, and they had openly participated, but saw no substantial changes from those past efforts. Many participants expressed doubt regarding how and why this study would yield any different results: “what difference will it make?” This became one of the project’s hurdles: past efforts appeared to have a dampening effect on recruitment for participation in this study.

**Participation limitations of IC elements.** The intelligence elements of Phase III each perform an important role within the IC; however, many consist of a comparatively small number of employees relative to the entirety of their workforce. While these elements indicated they wanted to participate in this study, many stated they did not have the resources nor the ability to segregate their agencies’ demographic data in order to examine the intelligence component separately. For instance, while some Phase III elements were able to provide the requested data for their agency’s intelligence component, most reported that their aggregate data, such as the MD-715, would not adequately reflect the information needed for the purpose of this study since the intelligence component of the workforce data is not separate but is blended into that of the entire element’s workforce data.

Likewise, while most Phase III elements were able to identify and provide senior IC managers for individual interviews, the small size of these elements further limited their ability to obtain sufficient volunteers to participate in focus groups. Of the total focus group participants, the Phase I ODNI-specific participants comprised 7%; Phase II Big Six Agencies comprised the majority of participation at 83%; and Phase III Other IC elements was only 10%. Thus, many of the Phase III elements were limited in their involvement in this study\(^52\). This led to a fragmented view of the ten elements that comprised Phase III. Given the variance in the data, this phase of analysis had to be handled and reported differently.

**Summary of data collection techniques.** The combination of these different modes of data collection allowed insights to be formulated into the design and impact of the IC’s diversity practices, thus increasing confidence in the findings of the study.

\(^{51}\) These factors are explored further in Appendix B.
\(^{52}\) Several Phase III elements, such as the Department of State Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR) and the intelligence components of the United States Air Force and the United States Navy, among others, have recently conducted their own internal barrier analysis studies. This study serves to compliment those efforts and to work in conjunction with the individual IC elements’ findings and recommendations.
Background on IC Workforce Diversity

Despite a ten-year effort to increase diversity, challenges persist and minority groups remain underrepresented in ODNI and the greater IC workforce, especially at senior levels (i.e., GS-13 and above). To examine this, a variety of IC-wide and agency-specific reports were reviewed, which provided necessary metrics to analyze workforce diversity trends.53 This review examined how key indicators of IC workforce diversity have evolved over the past five years based on annual ODNI reporting from FY2010 to FY2014 for the IC. With the release of the Annual Demographic Report on the Hiring and Retention of Minorities, Women, and Persons with Disabilities in the United States Intelligence Community Fiscal Year 2015 before the conclusion of data analysis, FY2015 data was also included for comparison.

Current Diversity Environment

Quantitative data collection (i.e., MD-715s, FEORP reports, etc.) was coordinated through ODNI’s Office of Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity (IC EEOD) and the various EEO and Human Capital offices at the individual IC agencies and elements. The following observations54 from the gathered reports provide useful context for understanding the diversity of the IC workforce and how the workforce profile has changed between 2010 and 2015:

- **IC Minority Averages:** 2011 – 23.2% | 2012 – 23.5% | 2013 – 23.7% | 2014 – 24.0% | 2015 – 24.6%

  - *Minority representation in the IC overall continues to trend positively.* Minority representation in FY2011 was 23.2% and increased to 24.6% in FY2015. Minority males at ODNI accounted for 7.8% in FY2010, but they increased their representation to 10.3% in FY2014. Of the Big Six IC agencies, NGA experienced the largest gain over the four-year period, progressing from their FY2011 number of 22.1% to 24.1% in FY2014 – a two percentage-point gain – almost achieving parity with IC averages by FY2014. FBI, DIA and NSA achieved similar percentage point gains with 1.6%, 1.8% and 1.4% respectively over the same time period. FBI hovered close to IC averages of minority representation 23.8% in FY2011 and a slightly above of 25.4% in FY2014. DIA,

---

53 Race and National Origin Categories:
Consistent with the Annual Report, this report’s data is defined in accordance with the race and ethnicity reporting requirements in the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) Management Directive 715 (MD-715) (EEOC MD-715, effective 1 October 2003. http://www.eeoc.gov/federal/directives/md715.cfm). Under this directive, employees who selected “Hispanic or Latino” as their ethnicity were defined as “Hispanic or Latino,” regardless of race. In addition, starting in FY 2004, EEOC data for individuals of Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander origin were reported separately from Asians. Also, unless otherwise noted, Whites refers to non-Hispanic Whites throughout the report.

however, was well above IC averages of minorities in the work environment and showed continued, albeit slight, improvement of their minority percentages of 29.8% in FY2011 to 31.6% in FY2014. NSA was below IC averages of minorities in the work environment, citing 19.4% in FY2011 and progression to 20.8% by FY2014. CIA achieved a .9 percentage point increase over the same period, continuing a slight upward trend on minority percentages moving from 23.1% in FY2011 to 24% by FY2014, both of these figures were on par with the IC percentages of minority representation. NRO was similarly above IC averages however, they did experience a slight decrease in their minority representation with 26.8% in FY2011 and 26.2% in FY2014.

- **IC Minority Representation compared to External Benchmarks.** The IC’s minority representation of 24.6% is lower than all of the external benchmarks generally used for comparisons: Minorities make up 37.5% of the U.S. Population, 35.4% of the Federal Workforce, and 31.5% of the Civilian Labor Force.

- **Minority Hiring showed increases.** In FY2015, overall IC minority representation in hiring increased from 23.6% (FY2014) to 24.9%, largely due to a 1.4 percentage point increase in Hispanic hiring.

- **IC Minority Representation compared to Internal Benchmarks.** Minorities are also represented at less than expected frequencies, with regard to promotions, awards, Selected Educational Development Programs, and Joint Duty assignments.

- **IC Female Averages:** 2011 - 38.6% | 2012 - 38.0% | 2013 - 37.54% | 2014 - 38.5% | 2015 - 38.5%

  - **Female representation remained (almost) static.** The proportion of women in the IC remained just below 40% over the last five years. ODNI’s female employees account for about 42% to 43% of the workforce while the male employees account for the other 56% to 57%. Three of the Big Six agencies experienced slight gains in female populations. The largest gain over the four-year time span was at FBI, which was at 38.5% in FY2011 and increased 3.3 percentage points to 41.8% in FY2014. Both NRO and NSA also experienced small gains – 1.5 percentage point and .1 percentage point, respectively. NRO rose from 49.7% in FY2011 to 51.2% in FY2014; and NSA was 40.5% in FY2011 and 40.6% in FY2014. CIA remained almost static with female percentages trending at 44.7% in FY2011 and dropping slightly to 44% in FY2014; while DIA showed a slight downward trend going from 34.7% in FY2011 to 33.6% in FY2014.

  - **IC Female Representation compared to External Benchmarks.** The IC’s female workforce, at 38.5%, is lower than external population benchmarks such as the U.S. population at 49.7%, Federal Workforce at 43.2%, and the Civilian Labor Force at 45.3%.

  - **Female attrition decreased.** The share of attrition for women in the IC decreased by 1.7 percentage points between FY2014 and FY2015.

  - **IC Female Representation compared to Internal Benchmarks.** Females earned above their representative percentages in promotions and awards. In FY2015, women earned
43.9% of promotions and 46.8% of the honorary awards, a rate above their representation in the workforce (38.5%).

- **IC Persons with disabilities Averages: 2011 - 5.3% | 2012 - 6.6% | 2013 - 7.0% | 2014 - 7.3% | 2015 - 7.9%**

  - *Representation of persons with disabilities increased.* Persons with disabilities in the IC workforce increased by just over one-half of one percentage point between FY2014 and FY2015. Persons with a disability accounted for 1.8% of the ODNI employees in FY2010 and 2.2% of ODNI employees in FY2014. Four of the Big Six agencies experienced gains in their populations of persons with disabilities – NRO and NGA had the largest gains with 1.9 percentage points and 1.3 percentage points respectively. NRO moved from 5.5% in FY2011 to 7.4% in FY2014 while NGA was at 6.6% in FY2011 and 7.9% in FY2014. FBI and DIA also experienced modest gains at 0.4% and 0.1% over the same time frame. FBI moved from 3.0% in FY2011 to 3.4% in FY2014 while DIA went from 10.9% to 11.0% (the largest percentage of persons with disabilities in the IC) in FY2014. CIA and NSA realized minimal losses in their respective populations of persons with disabilities. CIA persons with disabilities percentages held relatively stable, although well below IC averages, moving from 4.2% in FY2011 to 3.8% in FY2014. NSA also experienced a slight downturn, remaining below IC averages for persons with disabilities, starting with 6.9% in FY2011 and ending with 6.7% in FY2014.

  - *IC Persons with disabilities representation compared to external benchmarks.* IC persons with disabilities workforce, at 7.9%, is lower than the federal workforce at 8.99%.

  - *IC Persons with disabilities representation compared to internal benchmarks.* The IC persons with disabilities attrition rate, 6.9%, was slightly above the IC’s overall attrition rate of 6.3%.

The following observations provide highlights of current IC initiatives to improve focus on diversity inside the IC in 2015:

- CIA, NSA, and USAF adopted diversity and inclusion performance objectives as part of senior executive performance evaluations plans. Beginning in FY2016, ODNI and other IC elements will adopt similar requirements.

- The first “IC Persons with Disabilities Summit” was hosted by CIA at NRO. Through this forum, the IC EEOD Council launched three working groups to further educate the IC workforce and coordinate best practices for recruiting, retaining, and developing Persons with disabilities.

- DIA became the executive agent of the Intelligence Community Wounded Warrior Internship Program (ICWWP), a unique IC-wide initiative that aligns with the Department of Defense (DoD) Operation War Fighter Program. ICWWP identifies and places Wounded Warriors (WW) in a variety of internships across the IC based on their military skill sets, experience, and interests. According to a DIA interviewee, this provides injured, ill, and wounded service

---

55 These observations compiled from ODNI, “2015 Annual Demographic Report.”, and OPM, “2014 FEORP.”
members with meaningful work experience to assist in their recuperation and transition into the workforce through internship opportunities at participating IC agencies.

- IC EEOD hosted a “Diversity Best Practices Exchange Forum” to share ideas with invited members from private industry, academia, and senior IC leaders.

- The IC hosted the third “IC Women’s Summit” and the fourth “IC Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Allies Summit.”

- Four items were added to the IC Climate Survey, similar to those found in the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. As a result, in FY2015 ODNI began capturing OPM’s Inclusion Quotient (IQ) across the IC.\textsuperscript{56} The New IQ refers to inclusive intelligence and consists of 20 questions identified through a rigorous factor analysis trial of OPM’s Employee Viewpoint Survey questions.\textsuperscript{57} This new program is built on the idea that “individual behaviors, repeated over time, form the habits that create essential building blocks of an inclusive environment. These behaviors can be learned, practiced, and developed into habits of inclusiveness and subsequently improve the inclusive intelligence of organizational members.”

- The CIA and ODNI co-developed “No FEAR Act” online training to enable IC officers to understand their rights and remedies under the antidiscrimination and whistleblower protection laws. The PDDNI established reciprocity across the IC to enable all officers to gain credit if they completed this course.

- IC Chief Human Capital Office worked to improve data collection to capture RNO, gender, FY2015 promotion data, and disability information on participants in the IC Joint Duty program.

- IC EEOD launched disability awareness training to further educate the IC workforce and to share best practices. Additional training in working with persons with mental disabilities is being developed for roll-out in late 2016 or early 2017.

\textsuperscript{56} ODNI. “2015 Annual Demographic Report.”

\textsuperscript{57} OPM, “2014 FEORP.”
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The following provides a discussion of the major themes and findings from the data collection and analysis conducted for this report which covers the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), the “Big Six” agencies, and the ten IC elements.

The IC recognizes the importance of diversity and inclusion. From the publication of the 2004 Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act (IRTPA) which stated that the United States must enhance its foreign interests through “greater tolerance and respect for religious and cultural diversity” 58, to the 2006 establishment of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) IC Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Office (IC EEOD) 59, to the DNI’s most recent statements calling diversity “mission critical” at the 2016 Annual Women’s Summit 60, it is clear that the IC views diversity and inclusion as mission-essential elements. In recent years, the IC has worked to identify and promote employment practices designed to attract, retain, and develop a diverse workforce. These efforts are detailed extensively in ODNI’s FY2015 Annual Demographic Report on the Hiring and Retention of Minorities, Women, and Persons with Disabilities in the U.S. IC, and include such initiatives as providing undergraduate training programs for disadvantaged students; developing and strengthening employee resource groups; implementing implicit bias training; and more.

Across the IC, initiatives and activities are strategically aligned through senior advisory bodies such as the IC EEOD Council (comprising the EEO and Diversity senior principals of each IC element). The IC EEOD Council 61 collectively identified diversity, inclusion, and equal employment opportunity goals and adopted a joint roadmap for action, the IC EEO and Diversity Enterprise Strategy 2015-2020. 62 The Enterprise Strategy establishes a framework to ensure that the IC is best positioned to meet its mission-critical EEO, diversity, and inclusion imperatives. Through the implementation of the Enterprise Strategy, the IC is positioned to fully leverage capabilities, resources, and authorities to drive innovation and sustainability in five goal areas:

1. Leadership and Accountability;
2. Workplace Planning;
3. Recruitment, Hiring, and Retention;
4. Career Development and Advancement; and
5. Equal Employment Opportunity and Inclusion

61 The IC EEOD Council was established under IC Directive 110, “as a forum for coordination, evaluation, and improving EEOD in the IC.”
62 The IC EEO and Diversity Enterprise Strategy aligns with the NIS, the IC Chief Human Capital Office’s Vision 2020, and Executive Order 13583, establishing a Coordinated Government-wide Initiative to Promote Diversity and Inclusion in the Federal Workforce.
This study highlighted six major areas where the IC can take an integrated approach to the promotion and retention of a diverse workforce. In keeping with the goal areas of the Enterprise Strategy, the following variables were defined as key to assessing the state of diversity in today’s IC environment. These variables include:

- **Leadership**
  - Diversity Optics
  - Leadership Skills
  - EEO/Diversity Leadership Practices

- **Organizational Culture/Work Environment**
  - Workplace Diversity
  - Perceptions of “Tokens and Quotas” – Racial and Gender Stereotypes
  - Hierarchical Structures

- **Recruitment and Selection**
  - Need for Diversity in Recruiting Sources
  - Need for Cultural Sensitivities in Recruiting

- **Advancement**
  - Promotion/Opportunities
  - Mentoring
  - Key Assignments/Joint Duty Assignments/Career Development

- **Work/Life Integration**
  - Flexible Work Arrangements
  - Paid Family Leave

- **Persons with Disabilities**
  - Facilities and Assistive Technologies
  - The Employment Cycle: Recruitment, Career Development and Advancement
  - The Reasonable Accommodation Process
  - Self-Reporting of Disabilities

Within these areas, specific associated points narrow discussion to the most relevant topics for the IC as a whole. A large array of issues were exposed in this research; however, as many of these issues have been thoroughly reported through previous studies, such as in the Annual Demographic Report: Hiring and Retention of Minorities, Women, and Persons with Disabilities in the United States Intelligence Community, annual FEORP reports of individual IC elements, and the EEO MD-715 reports, those issues that elicited particularly strong responses from participants or were most prevalent within the targeted demographics across the IC are highlighted in this discussion.

Two primary themes underscore many of the findings of this report—the lack of diversity in leadership ranks and the lack of transparency in employment practices—which contribute to the perceptions of different treatment and experiences commonly held by employees of minority demographic groups in the IC. Following is a discussion of each of the key findings and recommendations, outlined according to the six key variables identified for this study.
1. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS – LEADERSHIP

“Leadership” is the role of the organization’s leaders and managers in pursuing excellence. In the context of workplace diversity and inclusion, leaders must set examples of fair and equitable behavior, ensure their employees comply with EEOD laws and IC directives and guidelines, and hold themselves and others accountable for fostering a workplace atmosphere of inclusiveness and respect. IC leaders can send a powerful message by making a genuine commitment to diversity and inclusion.

Successful diversity and inclusion programs require strong leadership, as leadership ultimately sets the tone for an organization. Because leadership and management “are necessarily linked, and complementary,” strong leadership must come not only from an organization’s most senior leaders, but also its mid-level managers, who often serve as the organization’s backbone. For many employees, these mid-level managers are the first-hand example of leadership’s directives, becoming “the voice” of the organization’s workplace initiatives. They are a high-risk group for diversity and inclusion problems, because they often have significant control over recruiting, hiring, promotion and advancement decisions. The difficulty, according to Harvard Business School professor of sociology Frank Dobbin, is that singling them out for special diversity training or programs implies that they are the worst culprits. Managers tend to resent that implication and resist the message.

Senior interviewees and focus group participants consistently expressed that mid-level managers do not provide the kind of leadership necessary to improve diversity and inclusion in the workplace. Some attributed this to senior leaders being unsuccessful in ensuring that their subordinate managers follow through on agency diversity efforts. Others described a lack of basic leadership skills at the middle management level. Still others pointed to EEOD’s standardized diversity training and perceived ineffective grievance and complaint processes as contributing factors. Almost all acknowledged a lack

63 Groysberg, B. and K. Connolly, “Great Leaders Who Make the Mix Work,” Harvard Business Review, https://hbr.org/2013/09/great-leaders-who-make-the-mix-work: “Nearly half the CEOs [interviewed for this article] said their most important role was to set the tone for the organization’s culture by demonstrating a commitment to inclusion.”

64 Groysberg and Connolly, “Great Leaders Who Make the Mix Work.”

65 Brescoll, V. “What Do Leaders Need to Understand about Diversity?” Yale Insights, January 1, 2011. http://insights.som.yale.edu/insights/what-do-leaders-need-understand-about-diversity. Brescoll quotes David Thomas, Professor of Business Administration at Harvard Business School: “We often see the people at the very top saying all the right things relative to diversity, but their middle management, who really run the organization and create the experience of people who work there, don’t understand and don’t feel accountable for diversity and inclusion.”

66 Dobbin and Kalev, “Why Diversity Programs Fail.”

67 Grievance processes are intended to provide employees with a system through which to challenge employment decisions. But instead of changing the negative behaviors or addressing the discriminatory complaint, many times managers confront the grievance report with ridicule, demotion, or retaliation. Once employees see that the grievance process isn’t working, they may become less likely to speak up.
of diverse representation in management and senior leadership as a potential hindrance to the advancement of underrepresented groups.

Based on the data collected, analysis of agency leadership in the context of workplace diversity and inclusion is broken down into three sub categories: diversity optics, leadership skills, and EEOD programs and policies. As discussed in the following sections, each of these subcategories is crucial to fostering a diverse and inclusive work environment in the IC. Following in Figure 11 is a summary table of the key leadership findings and recommendations, outlined according to the subcategories identified for this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Leadership</td>
<td>Managers and supervisors fail to provide the leadership necessary to foster a diverse and inclusive workplace.</td>
<td>Offer quality role models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Diversity Optics</td>
<td>Minority demographic representation in senior leadership is lacking.</td>
<td>Provide leadership education, mentorship opportunities and shadowing programs at lower and mid-levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Diversity Optics</td>
<td>Seeing someone from minority demographics in senior leadership is powerful and inspiring, and demonstrates an agency’s commitment to diversity.</td>
<td>Promote diversity at the top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Diversity Optics</td>
<td>Diversity in leadership helps attract a more diverse pool of applicants.</td>
<td>Identify a diverse array of aspiring leaders early on in their careers and nurture them to be prepared to eventually become senior leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Diversity Optics</td>
<td>“Token” promotions or appointments only serve to confirm negative stereotypes and alienate employees, and can compromise the mission.</td>
<td>Avoid &quot;tokenism&quot; in promotions and appointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Leadership Skills</td>
<td>Mid-level managers are viewed as lacking empathy for non-majority cultural experiences.</td>
<td>Offer empathy training as part of a comprehensive leadership education program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Leadership Skills</td>
<td>Mid-level managers often fail to address poor performance and workplace problems/inequities.</td>
<td>Invest in leadership training that promotes diversity and encourages cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 EEO/Diversity Leadership Practices</td>
<td>Diversity training, specifically the unconscious bias training, is well-intentioned but not sufficient and fails to impact long-lasting behavioral change.</td>
<td>Steer discourse about diversity and inclusion issues in a positive way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 EEO/Diversity Leadership Practices</td>
<td>Many grievances filed with the EEOD office are viewed as being ignored, or lead to retaliation from supervisors or co-workers.</td>
<td>Take steps to discourage retaliation and ensure, when possible, that the grievance process remains anonymous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 EEO/Diversity Leadership Practices</td>
<td>There is perception of widespread inconsistencies in how EEOD complaints are handled, and a lack of transparency throughout the grievance process.</td>
<td>Increase transparency and address perceived inconsistencies in the EEOD grievance process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. Leadership Findings and Recommendations Summary Chart

Diversity Optics

A compelling question posed to focus group participants was, “what would it mean to you to see a woman, minority, or person with a disability in a senior leadership position?” Participants responded that seeing someone from their demographic in senior leadership is not only powerful and inspiring, it demonstrates an agency’s commitment to diversity. Some argued that diverse leaders ultimately make the workplace a better, more encouraging place for minority demographics. For example, a minority male senior interviewee noted that the male/female ratio at NRO is pretty good (an assertion confirmed by the
statistics found in the IC Annual Demographic Report and to be discussed in this report’s section on Workplace Composition), and pointed out the fact that the DNRO is a female.

Relevant literature supports assertions that diversity in senior leadership can improve diversity throughout an organization. According to a recent Harvard Business Review article, diverse leaders benefit their organization’s diversity and inclusion efforts by bringing to the position their own experiences and understanding of what it is to be an outsider.68 The self-awareness, insight, and empathy that diverse leaders have gained from their own personal experiences often inform their priorities and shape their attitudes toward diversity and inclusion.

“...I go to Headquarters, and I see another minority – a black male – I want to hug him.” – African-American Male, NRO

“To reduce disparities with diversity in leadership, you must make aspiring leaders known to current senior leadership.” – Senior African-American Female Interviewee, FBI

“For me, having a woman lead is not an aspiration or something that needs to be done. It’s more that I want someone to lead who CAN lead. So when someone is chosen as a leader and is chosen just because she’s a woman, I find that . . . insulting.” – Caucasian Female, NGA

Intelligence community statistics confirm senior interviewee and focus group participant’s observations that minority demographic representation in senior leadership is lacking. According to ODNI’s FY2015 Annual Report concerning the hiring and retention of minorities, women, and persons with disabilities in the IC, minorities and women are underrepresented among managers in all pay grades.69 When comparing minority and non-minority groups to total managers, 78.6% of managers are non-minorities and 20.8% are minorities (compared to 24.6% of the IC in general). The disparity grows larger at higher levels of leadership. This trend is similar for women in the IC. Females represent 38.5% of the IC workforce, and 34% of all manager positions. Most of the IC’s managers are GS-13 to GS-15, but twice as many men are managers in those grades as compared to women (11.6% to 6%).70

Given these numbers, there is room for the IC to improve diversity in senior leadership. However, participants strongly cautioned against “token” promotions or appointments that only serve to provide diversity “window dressing.” Most agreed that while it is desirable to see leaders from diverse demographic backgrounds, agencies should not put someone in place simply because of their minority or demographic status. In fact, placing someone without the requisite skills and experience into a position of power might at best only serve to confirm negative stereotypes and alienate employees, and at worst prove dangerous if it compromises the mission. Instead, agencies should be smarter about identifying aspiring leaders early on in their careers and nurturing those individuals in an effort to prepare them to eventually become senior leaders in the agency.

68 Groysberg and Connolly, “Great Leaders Who Make the Mix Work.”
70 ODNI, 2015 Annual Demographic Report.
Recommendations and Best Practices: Diversity Optics

a. **Offer quality role models.** Diversity at the top promotes diversity throughout the rest of the agency. Not only does diversity in senior leadership signal an agency’s overall commitment to diversity, it provides diverse emerging leaders with role models they can identify with. Moreover, diversity in leadership can help attract a more diverse pool of applicants. However, agencies must avoid the appearance of “tokenism”; placing someone in a position because of their classification and not their ability can potentially set back the agency’s diversity and inclusion efforts.71

b. **Provide leadership education and mentorship at lower levels.** Agencies can ensure a diverse pipeline of potential leaders by identifying and nurturing talent at the agency’s lower levels, which tend to be more diverse. Involved and engaged leadership is the key. As one DIA interviewee noted, “If you are in a leadership position, you should lead and be a mentor. You don’t step on people to get where you want to go.” Agencies need to make a sincere effort to establish a process for identifying talented and diverse potential leaders early, then investing in their future through aggressive training and an appropriate style of mentorship. One important step would be to improve or expand formal mentorship programs, which can substantially increase diversity in management. Private industry research indicates that on average, such programs increase representation of African-American, Hispanic, and Asian-American women, and Hispanic and Asian-American men, by 9% to 24%.72 This research suggests that volunteer mentorship programs tend to be less successful because white male executives generally don’t always feel comfortable reaching out informally to young women and minority males. However, in a formal mentor program, these same executives are often eager to mentor assigned mentees, and women and minorities are usually the first to sign up for mentorship assignments.73

Leadership Skills

Leadership is the factor that most significantly impacts employee satisfaction, commitment, and engagement at work.74 Poor leadership not only influences employee morale in the office, it can negatively affect employees’ physical health and even their family life.75 In fact, a recent Partnership for Public Service survey of U.S. civil servants from all federal agencies (including the IC) indicates that leadership remains the primary barometer of how federal employees feel about their jobs.76 Survey participants consistently gave low scores to leadership at all levels of the federal government, from mid-

71 Groysberg and Connolly, “Great Leaders Who Make the Mix Work.”
72 Dobbin and Kalev, “Why Diversity Programs Fail.”
73 Thomas, “Mentoring and Irrationality.”
level managers to senior leaders—“a flashing red light that greater attention must be paid to developing leadership skills at all levels.”

Data collected for this study seems to support the results of the Partnership’s survey. A number of focus group participants expressed dissatisfaction with leadership—especially mid-level management. One key critique was that managers lack empathy, which can breed feelings of resentment and encourage a divisive work atmosphere. While such a work environment is unhealthy for all, it can be particularly harmful to diversity and inclusion efforts by discouraging cooperation and encouraging attrition. Focus group participants and interviewees emphasized that managers do not seem to understand the difference between managing projects and leading people. Senior interviewees noted that internal climate surveys reveal widespread dissatisfaction with managers. Focus group participants highlighted employees who were promoted to managerial positions despite lacking the necessary leadership skills and experience to do managerial work. One issue that often came up is managers’ avoidance of poor performance problems. A key task of a manager is to address performance and workplace problems. Ignoring problems and refusing to adequately mentor and guide employees has ripple effects on team performance and morale, and even employees’ health. In addition, when supervisors neglect to tell employees specifically how their work positively contributes to the mission, the employees feel undervalued.

Some participants were more positive, recalling specific instances when supervisors displayed more empathetic, involved leadership, which ultimately led to improvements in workplace diversity and inclusion. For example, a Caucasian female from NGA shared that her manager took an interest in her, getting to know her strengths and highlighting them in her review. This made her feel more included, since her manager made it clear that her work contributions really mattered to the agency. Moreover, an Asian male interviewee from NRO described how his managers helped him rise through the ranks by teaching him what he needed to learn for advancement. He also had a senior champion/sponsor who took the time to get to know him. This individual looked out for him and provided good advice that encouraged him to stay in the agency and pursue upper management positions. An African-American male interviewee from NRO has been similarly impressed by the leadership support he has received—he likes being at NRO despite the fact that his commute has doubled as a result. He noted that both the DNRO and the PDDNRO both rose through the ranks at NRO. He admires that the DNRO looks for opportunities to engage meaningfully with employees, whether it be through meet and greets or ERG events. He noted that she often sets aside time to come to such sessions and is “always in listening mode.” These interviewees noted that good leadership support had a direct impact on their decision to stay with their agency, as well as their ability to move up the ranks. As both NRO interviewees are minorities, this ultimately improved diversity in their workplaces. These examples of positive supervisor/manager experiences further underscore the importance of constructive, effective, and empathic interactions between managers/supervisors and employees.

Some minority or female individuals could believe that the lack of support from management could possibly be internalized as a confirmation of a culturally imposed stereotype that their demographic group was somehow less talented or capable in an area. This in turn could lead to an actual decrease in performance by the employee. This was found to be the case in Stanford University professor of social psychology Claude Steele’s work on “stereotype threat”, which he describes as “being in a situation where a negative stereotype about a particular group could apply. As soon as that is the case, the employee is aware that he or she may be judged in terms of that stereotype or treated in terms of it, or might inadvertently do something that would confirm the stereotype. And if the employee cares very much about doing well in that situation, the prospect of being treated stereotypically there is going to be

For the impacted employee, this would potentially impact their performance, further impairing mission accomplishment, group cohesion, and a sense of inclusivity. While everyone carries some particular stereotype threats, some demographic groups in the workplace are more impacted by these stereotype threats than others. Steele explains that women, minorities, and persons with disabilities carry stereotype threats often related to workplace competency and intellect issues (i.e., communication skills and math skills) which are viewed as more relevant in the workplace.

An African-American female focus group participant from the FBI discussed a recent TDY experience to another unit in the FBI where the work environment differed greatly from that of her current unit. She asserted that her current unit has managers but not leaders. These managers do not seem to take an interest in developing diverse rising leaders and make it difficult for these potential leaders to take advantage of opportunities to grow—ultimately sacrificing long-term gains for short-term goals. The leadership at the TDY unit, on the other hand, took her on as one of their own. They showed her the ropes and told her what she needed to do in order to advance. This participant was impressed with how the TDY leadership expressed interest in her personal goals—outside the FBI—and helped her create a career plan that allowed her to pursue her personal and professional goals. This participant noted that this kind of involved leadership is precisely what diverse employees—particularly women, minorities and, to a great extent, millennial employees—are seeking. Her observations are supported by recent research by Gallup, which found that millennials “see work and life as closely intertwined. Because of this, millennials want to have a different relationship with their manager. They want their manager to care about them as an employee and a person.”

Most complaints concerning senior leadership (or lack thereof) highlighted a lack of the “soft skills” commonly associated with empathy. Empathy is “a deep emotional intelligence . . . closely connected to cultural competence” that “enables those who possess it to see the world through others’ eyes and understand their unique perspectives.” According to a recent study conducted by human resources consulting company Development Dimensions International, individuals who master listening and responding to others make the most successful leaders. The study found that listening and responding with empathy is “overwhelmingly the one interaction skill that outshines all other skills leaders need to be successful.” Successful leaders are able to use empathy to understand their employees’ concerns, frustrations, and feelings, which is critical to understanding how to diffuse conflict and serve as effective mentors and involved leaders. However, research also indicates that empathy may be most lacking among the very people who need it most: middle- and senior-level managers. Even President Obama has spoken of a troubling lack of empathy in this nation: “there’s a lot of talk in this country about the federal deficit. But I think we should talk more about our empathy deficit—the ability to put ourselves in someone else’s shoes; to see the world through those who are different from us.”

82 DDI, Inc. “What Really Drives Performance?”
83 Wilson, “Empathy is Still Lacking.”
researchers attribute a decline in empathy to factors such as increased use of impersonal communication methods like email, which eliminate the need for in-person conversations.\textsuperscript{85} Fortunately, empathy is a skill that can be learned and practiced.

**Recommendations and Best Practices: Leadership Skills**

a. **Offer empathy training as part of a comprehensive leadership education program designed to foster a culture that supports diversity and inclusion.** Empathy provides the foundation for effective leadership in an increasingly diverse environment and should be part of a more comprehensive leadership education program designed to foster a culture that supports diversity and inclusion. Leaders need “the cultural competence to pick up on cues in [their] surroundings, the intellectual curiosity to explore other people’s reality, the 360-degree thinking to see all the way around a situation, [and] the adaptability to accommodate what [they] have come to understand.”\textsuperscript{86} Managers and supervisors need to understand the basics of managing and leading people, including basic functions like counseling, mentoring, and handling office conflict. Private industry is increasingly turning to empathy training as a means of improving leadership, retaining employees, and even guiding design decisions.\textsuperscript{87} About 20\% of U.S. employers offer empathy training as part of a management training program—a number that is expected to double in the next 10 years, given the positive impact such training has had on corporate results.\textsuperscript{88} One consulting company specializing in empathy training describes its vision of empathy in the workplace as “understanding of others’ experiences leading to action. It’s not a cup of tea and sympathy—it’s about action.”\textsuperscript{89} The company works with corporations to identify strengths and deficits and develop “empathy nudges,” which are “small changes that have a sustainable impact.”\textsuperscript{90}

b. **Invest in leadership training that celebrates and promotes diversity while also encouraging cooperation and positive-sum thinking.** Agencies can do this by encouraging leadership to better emphasize pride in the organization and its mission, as well as pride in America. It’s important to recognize and celebrate all of the things that make us different from each other—after all, diversity is one of the things that make this country great, and there are empirical reasons why agencies should embrace diversity in the workplace. Interacting with people who are different makes employees more creative, more diligent, and harder-working.\textsuperscript{91} Moreover, the presence of diversity in the workplace improves innovation by enhancing employees’ abilities to handle conflict and differences of opinion.\textsuperscript{92} However, diversity and inclusion efforts and pride in America go hand-in-hand. In order to truly discourage “us vs. them” thinking, leadership must get better at promoting a “one team, one fight” mentality. Research indicates that race is far less important in how people classify each other when they also share
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some other prominent social characteristic, like membership on a team. Leaders need to help those they lead to see that above all else, we are all Americans serving the same mission of protecting what makes this country great.

Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Leadership Practices

Each agency has an office devoted entirely to Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity (EEOD) issues. These offices function to perform the roles of compliance and facilitation of diversity and inclusion in the workplace. The compliance component involves a complaint process that is more investigatory. It provides workers with a process for addressing their complaints and providing full relief (see appendix D for an overview of the process). The diversity component is proactive and oriented toward improving existing workforce composition through recruitment, retention and development practices of diverse individuals. The diversity component of EEOD offices plays a leadership role in designing and implementing innovative EEO and diversity programs and diversity best practices to increase the overall representation of minorities, women, and persons with disabilities, and tracking model agency best practices for Title VII compliance. These actions by the diversity component serves to also reduce the number of complaints ultimately filed by individuals in the workplace.

The data collected during the course of this project largely concerned diversity training and the EEO complaint process. Senior interviewees tended to be more positive about the EEO complaint process than focus group participants. For instance, a senior African-American male interviewee stated that NRO is getting EEO right, crediting transparency and EEOD’s close relationship with HR: “we are in lockstep. It is deliberate; it is our mindset. We build trust.” Moreover, HR and EEOD employees are closely familiar with and understand each other’s functions. This enables EEO to implement policies that actually make sense.


94 “United States Equal Opportunity Commission. Overview of Federal Sector EEO Complaint Process. https://www.eeoc.gov/federal/fed_employees/complaint_overview.cfm. A complaint is an allegation of illegal discrimination that is handled through an administrative procedure. A complaint may result when an employee believes he or she has been unfairly treated because of race, color, national origin, religion, age, gender sexual orientation or physical/mental disability. The allegation itself is not proof that illegal discrimination has taken place. The investigation that follows the acceptance of issues from a formal complaint will provide the basis for a determination as to whether or not illegal discrimination has, in fact, occurred.
Focus group participants, however, were generally far more negative about EEOD and the complaint process. Criticism came from across agencies and from all perspectives, which seems to be indicative of a strong perception of the existence of widespread inconsistencies in how EEO complaints are handled, as well as a lack of transparency throughout the grievance process. For example, a Caucasian female participant from NRO likened the grievance process to a modern-day “witch-hunt,” describing the difficulties she encountered when she was accused of being disrespectful to foreign nationals. She reported that the charges were eventually found to not be substantiated, but the damage to her team’s cohesion was extensive. The experience convinced her that the EEO complaint process as it stands right now is not an effective way of dealing with workplace problems. Because the EEO process is so complex, legally intricate, and not fully understood by the general IC employee population, the general tendency of many employees is to either underestimate or overestimate what EEO capabilities are, or to miscalculate the lengthy timetables often required. Consequently, in situations requiring EEO assistance or intervention, often people choose to take no action vice trying to navigate through any formal processes. See Appendix D for a flow chart further detailing the complexities of the federal EEO complaint filing process.

Other focus group participants described similar difficult encounters as a result of the EEO complaint process, but for different reasons. These participants are under the impression that the complaint process is at best a useless mechanism for reporting workplace grievances, and at worst, a way to get fired or removed to a “nowhere job.” Most opined that the complaint process is not anonymous.95 Multiple participants reported filing complaints with the EEOD office, only to be retaliated against by supervisors or co-workers. A disabled African-American female from the CIA described the backlash she encountered from her supervisors when a medical issue prompted her to start the Reasonable Accommodation process with EEOD. An African-American male from DIA talked about two of his colleagues who were fired after filing EEO complaints that were ultimately substantiated. This perception of rampant retaliation is bolstered by official EEOC statistics, which reveal that 45% of complaints lodged with the EEOC in 2015 included a charge of retaliation.96

Another common criticism was that EEO complaints fall on deaf ears. An African-American female from the FBI voiced concern that management doesn’t properly address the numerous cases each year that are ultimately unsubstantiated. This participant suggested that agencies should still take these cases seriously because they involve individuals who were obviously frustrated enough to file an EEO complaint ― “leadership should be asking, ‘why?’”

Focus group participants and senior interviewees were generally positive about EEOD training. Several participants specifically praised the unconscious bias training, but expressed disappointment that it was not required of everyone and not all leaders had taken the training. Other participants voiced concern that diversity training and the EEO complaint process having an effect of producing overly sensitive, distrustful reactions that are often unintentional. These participants described an atmosphere where employees of different demographic groups tread carefully around each other for fear of becoming the next EEOD complaint. Participants also attribute management’s hands-off approach to this perceived

95 The EEOC does not guarantee anonymity in the formal complaint process. From the EEOC website: “In practice, it may be difficult to hide the identity of the person who believes they have been the victim of discrimination during the investigation, even though a name is never released, because of the circumstances of the charge.”

hypersensitivity—managers may be fearful of ‘getting involved’. The result is a negative and divisive atmosphere with little room for collaboration and interpersonal relationships.\textsuperscript{97}

**Recommendations and Best Practices:**

**Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Leadership Practices**

a. **Steer discourse about diversity and inclusion issues in a positive way.** Often, the hard part of leadership is managing expectations. Leaders should emphasize that diversity is a hard but worthy challenge—one that will not be successful overnight. Bringing together so many people from all walks of life increases the risk of misunderstandings and conflict. Yet, as previously discussed, conflict is one of the reasons why diversity makes for more innovative and effective teams.\textsuperscript{98} Leaders should therefore avoid using overly negative rhetoric while conducting diversity training and when handling diversity-related conflict and misunderstandings. For example, instead of using the term “micro-aggressions,” leaders might instead consider talking about misconceptions and mistakes. Taking an overly accusatory tone only leads to resentment, fear, and isolation.\textsuperscript{99} Empathy training could encourage employees to engage in meaningful dialogue following a diversity blunder, taking steps to foster a more inclusive workplace and utilizing the EEO complaint process for redress of unlawful discrimination.

b. **Take steps to discourage retaliation and ensure, when possible, that the complaint process remains anonymous.** Many participants reported that they suffered harm as a direct result of the lack of anonymity in the complaint process.\textsuperscript{100} A number of these participants reported being subjected to retaliatory treatment after it was discovered that they had filed an EEO complaint. Participants confirmed that this lack of anonymity and fear of retaliation often lead employees to avoid the EEOD complaint process altogether. This, in turn, leads managers to mistakenly conclude that their agency doesn’t have a problem and makes it difficult to get them to take diversity and inclusion initiatives seriously. Ultimately, agencies need to take steps to ensure that employees are not afraid of reporting discrimination.

c. **Increase transparency and address perceived inconsistencies in the EEO complaint process.** Focus group participants suggested that a more transparent approach to EEOD complaints might encourage more consistency of application. Agencies are required to provide No Fear Act training that covers the rights and remedies regarding discrimination and retaliation to employees, however, there seems to be a need for additional explanation beyond the mandatory No Fear Act training. Agencies might consider offering additional informal instruction or Q&A sessions on how the EEO process works and what rights are protected.

\textsuperscript{97} It is important to note that this study did not review the internal processes of agency EEOD offices. The sentiments expressed are solely the perceptions of individuals who participated in interviews and focus groups.

\textsuperscript{98} Phillips, “How Diversity Makes Us Smarter.”


\textsuperscript{100} The EEOC does not guarantee anonymity in the grievance process. From the EEOC website: “In practice, it may be difficult to hide the identity of the person who believes they have been the victim of discrimination during the investigation, even though a name is never released, because of the circumstances of the charge”. https://www.eeoc.gov/employees/confidentiality.cfm.
2. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS – ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE/WORK

Organizational culture defines the environment of the day-to-day status of the workforce – its ability to promote productivity and adaptability, and its effectiveness in creating environments of inclusiveness. An organization’s culture or work environment can have a major effect on whether certain groups of employees within the workforce perceive their workplace as inclusive. Organizational culture also defines the workplace relationships that form between different groups of employees. These groups can foster and promote positive balances between supervisors and employees and result in advancement and retention. Or, they can foster environments of exclusivity and elitism that can result in employee frustration and attrition.

Based on the data collected across agencies, analysis of culture in the context of workplace diversity and inclusion is broken down into three subcategories: workplace diversity, racial and gender stereotypes, and hierarchical structures. As discussed in the following sections, each of these subcategories is crucial to fostering a diverse and inclusive work environment in the IC. Following in Figure 12 is a summary table of the key Organization Culture/Work Environment findings and recommendations, outlined according to the subcategories identified for this study:

---

Diversity isn’t just about recruiting and retention. It’s about harnessing those statistics to achieve the complex mission we have.

DIA Deputy Director Doug Wise, Remarks at 2014 Annual Intelligence Community Women’s Summit, October 28, 2014

---
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### Findings Recommendations

1. **Workplace Diversity**
   - There is a perception in the IC of disenfranchisement among women, minorities and persons with disabilities.
   - **Recommendation**: Reiterate the roles of diversity and inclusivity as integral parts of the IC mission execution.

2. **Workplace Diversity**
   - There is a general belief that diversity and inclusion are not fully integrated into the IC's daily environment.
   - **Recommendation**: Hold leadership and staff accountable for behaviors outside the scope of Agency and IC Diversity Policies.

3. **Racial & Gender Stereotypes**
   - Many employees feel their employment is defined by their stereotype (e.g., angry black woman, quiet Asian, etc.).
   - **Recommendation**: Foster inclusivity in the workplace.

4. **Racial & Gender Stereotypes**
   - Participant input showed that each demographic has cultural sensitivities that can govern their perception inside the work environment.
   - **Recommendation**: Conduct an element or agency-wide Cultural Audit.

5. **Racial & Gender Stereotypes**
   - Stereotypical perceptions of employees can inhibit advancement and retention.
   - **Recommendation**: Ensure leaders model diversity and inclusion.

6. **Hierarchical Structures**
   - Hierarchical structured environments emphasize "elite" groups.
   - **Recommendation**: Emphasize top talent in all career paths of the IC.

7. **Hierarchical Structures**
   - Perceptions of impenetrable elite groups leave under-represented minority groups without avenues to advance and participate.
   - **Recommendation**: Encourage communication and coordination of Agency work teams.

---

**Figure 12. Organizational Culture and Work Environment Findings and Recommendations Summary Chart**

---

**Workplace Diversity**

Within the context of organizational culture and inclusive work environments, many focus group participants expressed concerns over “exclusive” groups which exist at their agencies based on pre-existing friendships, common backgrounds, and similar interests outside of work. They listed examples of groups that went to the same private high school or well-regarded university, and described those who served in the military as an exclusive group.

> When you understand an organization’s culture, then you can act as a catalyst for change . . . The only way we’re going to change culture is if people who think differently stick it out.

CAPT Heidi Berg, USN, DIA Chief of Intelligence Training, Remarks at 2014 Annual Intelligence Community Women’s Summit, October 28, 2014

Although informal social groupings are found in most workforces, a legitimate concern may arise for those individuals outside of such groups who may feel they are at a disadvantage for being selected for promotion or special assignments required for career advancement. Such concern could stem from the perception of favoritism toward certain majority groups enabled by an ‘old boy’ network who have previously worked together and who tend to draw on individuals from within their demographic group rather than from the full range of qualified employees.
Relationships also exist within the workplace—regardless of inclusion or exclusion from exclusive groups—that also have an effect on the work environment and employees. Workplace “relationships” can be defined in three ways: between individuals, between units or departments that perform different tasks, and between the people and the nature and requirements of their jobs. When looking at the IC as a whole, the quality of those relationships and their modes of conflict management was also considered. Support from published research indicates that efforts to suppress a group identity were positively related to perceived discrimination, which predicted job satisfaction and turnover intentions. These results suggest that minority employees actively manage their outward identities while at work and that these identity management strategies have important consequences.104

Within the discussion and definition of relationships, a compelling question that was asked of the participants in the focus groups was: “Do you feel that you have to hide an aspect of your personality or identity at work?” Many focus group participants affirmed they did have feelings of alienation and felt they had to hide aspects of themselves in the workplace: from parental status, to assertiveness, to minority group affiliation. Employees who constantly feel that they have to hide aspects of their personalities, home lives, or personal affiliations may feel disadvantaged or less engaged compared to what they perceive as their main-line counterparts.

A new report from Deloitte focuses on the issue of hidden aspects or ‘covering,’ in the workplace. ‘Covering,’ the report explains, was defined by sociologist Erving Goffman as “how individuals with known stigmatized identities made a “great effort to keep the stigma from looming large’.” For example, President Franklin Roosevelt who made sure he was always seated at a desk when his cabinet came into the room to de-emphasize his physical disability, or a female employee who avoids talking about her children at work.105 Further, research shows that it’s more widespread than leadership probably imagines. A survey conducted for the Deloitte report shows 75% of employees cover up some part of their identity at work, and covering is almost universal among traditionally marginalized groups: 94% of blacks and 80% of women hide aspects of themselves in the workplace. For instance, several female African-American focus group participants spoke of being told to “tone it down” by colleagues and supervisors in order not to appear to be an “angry black woman.” One male African-American participant described how he could “be himself” in the workplace around other African-Americans, but outside of that demographic, he felt the need to use “white words.” Certainly, it is universal that everyone must adapt to their professional environment. Regardless of gender, race, or disability status, everyone must mind their appearance, must dress presentably, and must speak more formally in the workplace than they might in a more casual setting. Hiding aspects of one’s personality at work is both common and understandable—there is an expectation that all employees be reasonably sociable, conscientious, and collaborative regardless of whether these traits run counter to their nature. But just because wearing a work mask is commonplace doesn’t make it harmless. Covering, the report finds, drives disengagement. Half of respondents said the need to hide aspects of themselves affected their sense of the opportunities available to them at the organization, and that this had “somewhat” to “extremely” affected their sense of commitment to the

“In our professional atmosphere, we can’t just be ourselves. We mask ourselves in all these different interactions with different people, different staff, different executive levels—we don’t want to hide our true selves, and we certainly don’t want to be treated differently than someone else who doesn’t have to hide.” Non-Attributed Female, FBI
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Importantly, a trend emerged from the focus groups and interview data indicating that this adaptation may be impacting women—particularly minority women—more deeply.

Several women who participated in the focus groups expressed that they felt the need to hide aspects of their personalities that were considered too strong, confrontational or authoritative. Within the focus groups, a behavioral double-standard between men and women, especially when disagreeing with managers, was often highlighted. Women spoke repeatedly about having to ‘tone it down.’

It is worthwhile to note that some employees expressed not feeling comfortable identifying their Race/National Origin (RNO) on applicant/EEO self-identification forms because of perceived opportunities for discrimination, or because they did not ‘fit the boxes’ defining RNO by the EEOC. These factors might be considered for further inquiry.

Hidden disabilities, especially medical and mental health issues, were raised as another key factor of personalities that often must be hidden in the workplace. The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration reports in its findings from the 2006 Healthstyles survey that only 42% of surveyed adults think that a person with mental illness can be as successful in the workplace as others, and nearly a quarter of younger workers surveyed (adults between the ages of 18-24) believe that a person with mental illness is dangerous to others. This trend was reflected in this study. During several senior interviews, it was noted that disabilities within the workforce often go unreported.

Recommendations and Best Practices:

Workplace Diversity

a. **Reiterate the roles of diversity and inclusivity as integral parts of the IC mission execution.**

According to John Coleman’s article for Harvard Business Review on the components of great corporate culture, the implementation of organizational culture begins with the Values or Mission statement to provide purpose and guidance to employees. The enunciation of this Mission statement is reinforced by the five other components (Values, Practices, People, Narrative, and Place) of providing work environments that work to navigate cultures and retain star employees. Each IC member agency has and publishes guiding documents which include diversity as a core mandate for mission execution. It is important to emphasize diversity in these statements and in the workplace on routine bases to keep the ideals of diversity awareness and inclusivity in the forefront of everyday practices in the workplace.

---


b. **Hold leadership and staff accountable for behaviors outside the scope of Agency and IC Diversity Policies.** Tom Rausch, a leading corporate culture change consultant and leadership coach, recommends in his article on organizational culture, to “Create Behavioral Promises” with employees to “create behaviors that employees can easily understand and model.” The key components of these Corporate Behavioral Promises include:

- Holding employees accountable for behavior contradictory to established policies on diversity and inclusion;
- Embracing constructive feedback;
- Admitting mistakes and working to fix and learn from them.

Frank Dobbin and Alexandra Kalev take this concept a step further in their research on social accountability, discussing the need to instill “social accountability” through individual diversity managers or teams of diversity managers serving on diversity task forces or councils in the workplace as a means to “work on the causes of race, ethnic and gender inequality” and as a means of promoting diversity. Through these approaches, diversity managers can: act as a stimulus for encouraging employees to make the right diversity-related decisions and think more about their actions in the workplace; brainstorm and immediately put into action new ideas for recruitment, training and promotion for diversity employees; and can determine where diversity problems exist within the organization.

### Perceptions of ‘Tokens’ and ‘Quotas’ – Racial and Gender Stereotypes

Similar to the organizational concerns involved with diversity in the work environment, there were concerns mentioned during the focus groups regarding the workplace perceptions of ‘token’ employees, ‘quota’ hires and stereotypes of particular demographic groups. Renewed efforts across the IC to increase outreach to diverse potential employees has resulted in a backlash of comments that imply that any minority, female, or disabled employee might only have been offered employment or advancement because of their status in one of these categories.

Labels like ‘token’ or ‘quota’ hires diminish an employee’s qualifications, according to writer Diane Chinn in “Effects of Cultural Stereotyping in the Workplace.” This stereotyping affects employee morale and productivity, leaving impacted employees feeling minimized and more likely to leave the organization if they believe that stereotypes, not ability and performance, determine how they are treated. Research from Michigan State University shows that the perception of ‘token’ hires in the workplace

---


leads to harmful outcomes including less effective work relationships with colleagues and supervisors, increased work tension, decreased job satisfaction, intentions to quit, and job withdrawal.\textsuperscript{112}

In a similar way, gender stereotypes in the workplace can undermine women’s career advancement. According to the Catalyst Study “Women Take Care, Men Take Charge: Stereotyping of US Business Leaders Exposed” “men consider women to be less adept at problem-solving, one of the qualities most commonly associated with effective leadership and a hallmark behavior of a CEO.”\textsuperscript{113} Alarming, the study states that, for those women who are able to effectively ‘break’ the stereotypes and ascend to management or senior leadership levels, others are even more apt to judge her sharply. Because people are more likely to believe information that confirms gender-based stereotypes, a female manager’s leadership skills are judged more harshly by her colleagues, and she must fight for credibility with the employees she supervises. Without proactive steps by the organization to validate and legitimize senior female leaders in the workplace, taking steps to eradicate bias, female leaders will continue to be undermined and misjudged.\textsuperscript{114}

**Recommendations and Best Practices:**

**Racial and Gender Stereotypes**

a. **Foster inclusivity in the workplace.** Leadership is the driving force of workplace culture. Management sets the behavior standards through their words and actions, along with policies and procedures. Design and implement strategies to connect organization horizontally and vertically to maximize full employee participation and facilitate cooperation and collaboration and ensure constructive conflict resolution.

b. **Conduct an Agency-wide Cultural Audit.** Private industry is increasingly turning to cultural audits as a means of examining leadership’s attitudes toward employees, the nature and effect of team work and communication, employee and management responsibility, accountability, trust, inclusion and respect. A cultural audit, according to OPM\textsuperscript{115}, gathers feedback from large numbers of employees about their perceptions of inclusion and invites suggestions for changes. Audit results identify areas for change and ongoing programs for employee awareness.\textsuperscript{116} Establishing a teamwork approach to cultural inclusivity issues allows employee engagement to address stereotype and/or cultural issues that could negatively impact organizational results.

c. **Ensure Leaders model diversity and inclusion.** Leaders must model diversity and inclusion throughout the course of their management duties—not just for a conference or only at staff


\textsuperscript{114} Welbourne, T. “Women Take Care.”


meetings. Senior leaders and managers should become a part of the diversity and inclusion process.117 Diversity should not be a separate program; rather, leadership should include diversity into all processes and programs of the IC, and leaders should build social accountability into the system so that managers take responsibility for creating diverse and inclusive work environments.

Hierarchical Structures

IC agencies tend to be hierarchical in nature. The effects of this hierarchical structure are far-reaching within the workplace environment. This perception goes beyond the expected positions of authority (i.e., Director, Chief of Staff, etc.) or paygrade (DISL, SIS or GS-15) and also considers certain jobs or career paths as ‘higher’ on the hierarchical scale. Some employees who participated in the study reported perceptions of specific high visibility jobs (e.g., Special Agent, Linguist or Analyst) being designated as “more important” or “better” than others, despite pay grade. These jobs are seen as having more advantages and opportunities for advancement. According to approach/inhibition theory, individuals in perceived higher roles are more likely to speak out of turn, exhibit socially inappropriate behaviors and treat others in hostile and aggressive ways.118 A stratification of the work force becomes more evident as time goes on, and beliefs become entrenched that certain employee categories promote more quickly, have more positional authority and are in more advantageous job positions. This is evidenced by the statistics shown in the most-recent ODNI Annual Demographic Report (see Current Diversity Environment section). Although there are modest gains in IC minority populations, the numbers have remained virtually stagnant in the lower quarter percentile.119 These numbers are well below the Civilian Labor Force and US population numbers which are firmly grounded in the thirtieth percentile.120 Consequently, information does not flow freely, priorities become fixated on the immediate supervisor rather than the organization, and productivity is stifled.121 In keeping with this model, and according to Equity Theory, employees in the lower ranks feel unfairly treated by the group and leadership, reducing their motivation to contribute.122

118 Groysberg and Connolly. “Great Leaders Who Make the Mix Work.”
The IC’s hierarchy may affect how individuals of targeted demographics are treated or perceive how they are treated. For instance, a senior interviewee shared that often others assumed that he, an African-American male, was from a lower rung of the hierarchy until they talked to him and discovered he had multiple advanced degrees. He recalled instances when visitors at first looked past him, or paused awkwardly from surprise after meeting him. The work Umphress et al. conducted on their Theory of Social Dominance found that an individual’s Social Dominance Orientation (i.e., the tendency to hold non-egalitarian values and to support hierarchically structured relationships among social groups) and a hierarchical work environment could have important consequences for their career advancement and salary.

These trends were reflected in this study: participants of interviews and focus groups indicated that ODNI, the Big Six Agencies, and the other IC elements do indeed have strong hierarchies. A study on how hierarchical workplace structures apply social dominance theory may help explain this. This study indicates that individuals have varied degrees of Social Dominance Orientation research found that white males in organizations with strong hierarchies welcome other white males to the organization, while women, minorities, and persons with disabilities—groups with a presumably lower status in the organization—reject others from low-status groups. If this finding were to hold true at ODNI and in the greater IC, audiences would be hesitant to readily accept and help women, minorities, or persons with disabilities to become acculturated into the intelligence community environment. This may be a specific underlying cause of many of the difficulties experienced by women, minorities and persons with disabilities as they progress through employment in the IC and bolsters the theory that people in general, both employees and supervisors, are more comfortable with; more willing to hire and promote; and more willing to seek out and accept career guidance and advice from people that fit their own demographic.

Recommendations and Best Practices: Hierarchical Structure

There are numerous social theories that say that hierarchies in the work environment can result in motivation and competition leading to increased productivity. However, the majority agree that in ‘steeper’ hierarchies—that is, those hierarchical structures with large divides between groups which are not necessarily dependent the others for motivation for productivity—that these types of structures have a corrupting influence on work environments. In fact, for many tasks, a more decentralized, egalitarian approach to decision making can lead to better judgments. Consequently, in order to have a functioning organization in the face of such hierarchical structure, it is important to make sure that all demographics (inclusive of women, minorities and persons with disabilities) have avenues to contribute to mission success, advancement and participate in leadership roles. Ways to accomplish this include:

a. **Emphasize top talent in all avenues of the IC.** Both Jay Galbraith’s Star Model Framework of Organizational Culture and the Neilson, et al Principles of Organization Design, suggest that

---
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highlighting top performers in all aspects of an organization stresses the importance of all organizational areas to the completion of Agency mission.\textsuperscript{129} By minimizing stratification of career paths (e.g., Agent, Analyst, Linguist, Planner, etc.), each one can be emphasized as having value to the overall mission of the organization.

b. \textit{Encourage communication and coordination of agency work teams}. As steep hierarchies, such as in the IC, are shown to reduce trust, increase competition, and impede communication between employees on different levels. Facilitation of communication and coordination between intra-group segments of the work force is integral to guard against these outcomes.\textsuperscript{130} Make leaders responsible and accountable for empowering each employee focus area with value and validity to the agency’s mission by forming intra-group forums and opportunities to coordinate function with other groups.


In an effort to retain a competitive edge in recruiting, IC recruiting efforts have increasingly become more corporate in scope when compared with past recruiting efforts. Today the IC mirrors private corporations by seeking the most qualified individuals using competitive rates, well-advertised benefits, and the possibility of upward mobility. Current IC efforts to attract the brightest talent have combined individual efforts among components to attract the sharpest industry skills. The DNI’s 2006 Human Capital Strategic Plan outlined efforts to appeal to millennials by direct recruiting approaches before graduation in an effort to ease the long wait times for security clearance adjudication.\textsuperscript{131} This approach greatly increased the IC’s ability to reach out to a more diverse candidate pool by strategically targeting specific programs at non-traditional schools including Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) and schools with strong Hispanic and Asian student populations.

However, a 2016 study in diversity recruiting efforts co-sponsored by Stanford University and the University of Toronto, highlighted that, despite stated efforts at increasing diversity in the workplace, minority candidates applying for job openings find their prospects of being hired just as limited as before diversity efforts were instituted.\textsuperscript{132} In fact, an article in \textit{Harvard Business Review} noted that “most diversity programs simply made white workers feel that their employer was now treating minorities fairly, whether that was true or not.”\textsuperscript{133} Interestingly, this study also spoke to the practice of ‘resume whitening,’ that is, altering names, backgrounds and language that could lead to conscious or unconscious discrimination during the hiring process.\textsuperscript{134} They noted, however, in workplaces that are more successful in instituting ‘real’ diversity initiatives, that ‘resume whitening’ was less prevalent as diversity candidates felt more secure in offering factual personal information.

Recruiting is an ongoing strategic intelligence concern to bring new insight and experience into the community. Historically, IC agencies could adopt a mentality that good recruits would be hired with minimal effort at traditional Intelligence source universities. As the IC moves forward into a new administration and into an environment where millennials have an increasing importance in the job


\textsuperscript{134} Lam, B. “When Resumes Are Made Whiter.”
market, it is important to reach out to diverse populations proactively. For this newest generation of the work force, competitive recruiting incentives go beyond the past generations’ concerns focused on salary requirements – millennial recruitment efforts must also provide substantive information on progression, growth and intellectual challenges provided in the work environment.\(^\text{135}\)

Based on the data collected across agencies, analysis of recruitment and selection in the context of workplace diversity and inclusion is broken down into two subcategories: the need for diversity in recruiting sources, and the need for cultural sensitivities in recruiting. Just as recruiting efforts should consider the hiring needs of millennials in order to recruit effectively; so, too, should hiring efforts consider the intricacies of minority cultural conventions, including social, economic, and psychological affiliations needs based on culture and societal norms. As discussed in the following sections, each of these subcategories is crucial to fostering a diverse and inclusive work environment in the IC. Following in Figure 13 is a summary table of the key recruitment and selection findings and recommendations, outlined according to the subcategories identified for this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment and Selection</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity in Recruiting</strong></td>
<td>IC female, minority and disabled employees perceive recruiting efforts to be geared only to historical “White male” universities which perpetuates majority hiring practices.</td>
<td>Effectively communicate successes in diversity recruitment internally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity in Recruiting</strong></td>
<td>Recruiting teams have limited commonality with perspective applicants at historically Black, Hispanic or Asian universities if they are composed of predominantly Caucasian team members. Minority applicants have to compete against the ‘status quo bias’ when competing for jobs against a predominantly white applicant pool.</td>
<td>Include additional representatives from minority groups on recruiting teams, which should also facilitate having multiple applicants from minority groups included in the applicant pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity in Recruiting</strong></td>
<td>IC recruiting teams have difficulty establishing the IC as a viable career opportunity if they are only present at annual University Hiring/Job Fairs.</td>
<td>Partner with student organizations to attract minority candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Sensitivity in Recruiting</strong></td>
<td>Certain minority cultures (e.g., Hispanic Communities) require understanding of cultural sensitivities when considering job opportunities. Family plays a large role in job decisions.</td>
<td>Understand the important role of family in Hispanic Culture for applicants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Sensitivity in Recruiting</strong></td>
<td>There is a perception in some Hispanic Recruiting areas that the IC has no understanding of Hispanic culture or other Hispanic employees -- families want to think their family members will not be left without cultural support.</td>
<td>Incorporate appropriate employee cultural representatives into the recruiting process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Sensitivity in Recruiting</strong></td>
<td>Some Historically Black, Hispanic, Asian or Disabled Universities only receive IC recruiting teams sporadically. There is no effort made to build trusted relationships advocating the IC as a positive career.</td>
<td>Continue efforts to establish trusted relationships with diversity-rich schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13. Recruitment and Selection Findings and Recommendations Summary Chart

Need for Diversity in Recruiting Sources

In the commercial business sector, diversity and inclusion programs are of great importance with social justice and parity issues in the work environment. However, in the IC, diversity populations offer a crucial benefit of expanding the organization’s diversity of thought. People with diverse backgrounds, cultures and experiences offer opportunities to look at national security target sets with different vantage points, perspectives and cultural lenses which, in turn, offer advantages for analysis and recommendations beyond traditional ‘group-think’ models from homogenous scenarios.  

Throughout the interviews and focus groups, it was generally acknowledged that changing the demographic makeup of the workforce is complex and takes time. Two senior interviewees explained that a factor restraining diversity expansion within the IC is a recent three-year hiring freeze that followed sequestration in 2012. Although government hiring freezes typically lead to lower attrition rates, they also lead to fewer new-hire positions and promotions available. With limited positions that can be filled externally, fewer real opportunities to increase diversity in hiring have existed. Thus, one senior interviewee noted that it may be too early to accurately evaluate the outcomes of the IC’s external recruiting efforts, especially those directed at targeted diversity recruiting.

Many focus group participants noted that without visible results (e.g., recruiting approaches that emphasize outreach to diverse groups resulting in a diverse array of new hires), women, minorities, and persons with disabilities are unconvinced by leadership’s professed commitment to diversity. In fact, the Diversity Senior Advisory Panel noted in 2004 that intelligence agencies repeatedly visited the same schools for recruiting purposes. Little is perceived by employees as having changed. Specific hiring trends were frequently noted by focus group participants as only approaching ‘traditional’ IC recruiting sources, which are all typically within the greater Washington, DC geographic area (George Washington University, Johns

Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies and American University among others) and traditionally composed of majority Caucasian student populations.

Although the IC Centers of Academic Excellence Program\textsuperscript{138} lists numerous institutions of higher learning that cater to diverse student populations (e.g., Howard University, Bowie State University and University of Texas El Paso, etc.), there remains a perception that IC recruitment tends to do what has always been done: “go to Georgetown and George Washington” instead of branching out to universities with more diverse populations.\textsuperscript{139} When questioned why this was the perception, focus group participants explained that recruiting successes in diversity (i.e., instances where women, minorities and persons with disabilities were selected for key strategic positions, etc.) were not widely communicated. Indeed, this communication breakdown was also cited as a frustration among managers and leadership who are actively engaged in outreach and other recruiting activities.

Another frustration voiced by focus group participants was the observation of having just one minority candidate in certain applicant pools, or of being the only one of a particular minority group represented in certain working groups. The problem with diversity hiring initiatives, according to Stefanie Johnson, a professor at the University of Colorado Boulder’s Leeds School of Business, is that hiring teams often push to include only one minority in the applicant pool, which gives that person “about the same consideration for the job as if he or she weren’t included at all.” Indeed, efforts to include minority candidates in applicant pools that are predominantly Caucasian or male can sometimes serve to highlight how different that applicant is from the norm. Deviating from the norm can be risky for decision makers, as people tend to ostracize those who are different from the majority group. For applicants from underrepresented groups, having one’s differences made salient can lead to inferences of incompetence. Research shows that in a finalist pool where all other applicants are Caucasian or male, the one minority or female candidate is viewed as ‘different’, and different was shown to be equated with ‘less qualified’, ‘risky’, and even ‘incompetent’. Thus hiring managers unconsciously preferred to hire one of the Caucasian or male candidates. However, the results shifted dramatically—more than the statistical odds—in favor of successful hiring of minorities or females when there were two or more minority or female candidates in the finalist pool.\textsuperscript{140}

Extensive discussion about recruiting revealed some tension between short-term, visible progress and longer-term solutions. Interviewees and focus group participants who have worked in Human Capital and Recruiting said their roles had little insight or working knowledge into the demographic composition of the IC’s applicant pool. For years, the IC has lacked a robust applicant tracking system, one that tracks gender, race/national origin and other self-identifying demographic information (e.g., veteran status, disability, etc.). The new IC Applicant Gateway, implemented as a pilot in October 2015, will better enable recruiters and hiring managers to see who is interested in employment in the IC and discover when individuals within these groups are hired, drop out or are rejected during the hiring process.\textsuperscript{141} Current and former HR employees who participated in this project strongly believed that this data is necessary to measure and communicate progress in a way that resonates with seniors across the IC.


\textsuperscript{139} ODNI. Annual Report on Hiring and Retention of Minority Employees in the Intelligence Community FY 2014. pp. 10-11.


\textsuperscript{141} The IC Applicant Gateway provides a portal for IC career information in a new website (IntelligenceCareers.gov) and, ultimately, a mechanism to apply to a number of IC agencies through one central location. The new website became operational in October 2015 and includes career information for DIA, NSA, NSA and ODNI. The actual capability to apply for vacancies at those agencies through the IntelligenceCareers.gov site will be available in the fall of 2016.
Several minority participants noted that recruiting is easier for certain IC elements, such as the FBI, especially given Hollywood’s influence. However, the FBI continues to struggle with attracting qualified minority applicants. As one senior African-American male interviewee observed, “with little to no advertising, the FBI gets approximately 20,000 applications for a (Special Agent) class,” yet “in general recruiting, minorities get drowned out by the majority.” Moreover, because this large pool of candidates is dominated by white male applicants, when the much smaller pool of candidates who are actually qualified is identified, there are naturally more white males than minorities because of the larger original applicant pool. Thus the FBI struggles to compete for qualified minority candidates with private sector companies, many of which offer higher salaries and typically have a less extensive background investigation process.

Across the focus groups, it was noted that there is a perception that the IC tends to hire military officer retirees who have experience working among senior leadership in high visibility jobs. This recruiting source tends to be comprised mostly of males, and in particular, white males, which adds to diversity shortfalls. This may soon be rectified as the Senate recently voted to reinstate a Defense Department restriction on military retiree hiring which would require a waiting period of at least 180 days after the candidate left military service before they can be considered for a civilian position.142

As seen across industry, successful diversity recruiting for ODNI, the Big Six Agencies, and the greater IC is a complex and multi-faceted program, requiring careful year-over-year relationship building at the agency level, with specific attention to the facets that make each IC element unique. For instance, the FBI might look at non-traditional sources for recruiting that could lend diversity from the general population. According to Malik Aziz, the national chairman of the National Black Police Association, “the pool of qualified candidates of color is there.”143 Aziz noted that the FBI looks more at candidates who aren’t coming from traditional law enforcement, despite the fact that there are over 100,000 black police officers in the country. He suggested that “instead of focusing recruitment on individuals who have completed college and are looking for specific jobs in the FBI, the FBI might look at the many police departments who have shown a great commitment to law enforcement.”144

An interesting side discussion arose during the focus groups and interviews. The discussion focused on the issue of economic diversity—that is, recruiting talent from all socio-economic levels. An individual’s socio-economic status may impact their grades, limit their extracurricular experiences (such as study abroad), or the ability to compete for unpaid internships. All of these have implications for hiring and selection. While thought provoking, the idea of socio-economic diversity was outside the scope of this study, but may be worth further study.


144 Horwitz, "As U.S. Pushes Police to Diversify."
Recommendations and Best Practices:
Diversity in Recruiting Sources

a. **Effectively communicate successes in diversity recruitment internally.** By heightening awareness of the successful recruiting efforts to expand diverse talent within the IC, employees of minority demographics will see more relevant examples of individuals from targeted demographic groups successfully moving into decision making and leadership roles.

b. **Include more minority applicants in the candidate finalist pool.** According to the *Status Quo Bias*, simply including a minority candidate in the finalist pool isn’t enough. Research shows that in a finalist pool where all other applicants are white men, the one minority candidate is viewed as ‘different’, and different was shown to be equated with ‘less qualified’, ‘risky’, and even ‘incompetent’. Thus hiring managers unconsciously preferred to hire one of the white male candidates. However, the results shifted dramatically - more than the statistical odds - in favor of successful hiring of minorities when there were two minority candidates in the finalist pool.

The results of this study strongly indicate that decision makers could improve the workforce’s diversity – by hiring more diverse candidates – by increasing the number of minority candidates in the finalist pools.

c. **Partner with student organizations to attract minority candidates.** Partnerships with student organizations that promote diversity and inclusion can widen IC applicant pools. National diversity organizations such as Hispanic Professional Engineers, National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering, etc. can help IC recruiting efforts hone in on specific target sets for hiring (e.g., engineers, computer analysts, etc.) while at the same time assist in sponsoring career fairs or specific hiring events on campus. One way to consider reaching these students at the point in their collegiate levels conducive to recruiting efforts is through social media. 94% of corporate recruiters use—or plan to use—social media avenues to reach potential applicants, and 66.7% of these first time job seekers use social media to look for work. As social media use in recruiting continues to increase, IC recruiters may be left out of talented applicants if they do not adapt to include social media as a recruiting resource.

Need for Cultural Sensitivities in Recruiting

To attract candidates from diverse demographic and minority groups, it is important to be sensitive to cultural aspects that may influence employment decisions. One of the key demographics with higher attrition rates inside the IC as a whole is the Hispanic community, which will be the focus of this discussion. While this is an important variable to understand with all groups, the Hispanic community was chosen to focus this discussion principally because they represent one of the key demographics underrepresented in the IC due to recruitment problems and high attrition rates. As was emphasized by multiple minority employees’ comments across the IC during the focus groups section of data collection for this project, recruiting in Hispanic communities requires the establishment of trusted relationships— not only between the recruiting agency and the potential employee but also with the potential employee’s school representatives, and even their family. These relationships cannot be established immediately and expected to be successfully formed after one recruiting visit to a historically Hispanic school.

---
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and recruiting officials must make a multi-year investment in grooming contacts to act as Hispanic recruitment advocates. In the face of more lucrative opportunities – especially for low-density, high-demand qualifications (STEM)—the IC must be viewed as the more trusted option to potential candidates. (See Appendix C for more information on Hispanic experiences in the IC work environment).

According to Pew Research, Hispanic millennials are much less likely to be immigrants and more likely to be English proficient. As the youngest major racial group in the United States with a current age range between 18 and 33; 47% of US Hispanics are under the age of 18. They are more likely than other racial demographics to have a long-lasting impact in the IC into the future. By comparison, only 20% of US-born Caucasians are younger than 18; and 27% of US African-Americans are under 18. Among these second and third-generation Americans, college graduation and home ownership rates are expected to increase almost 7% and 13%, respectively. Recruiting efforts within the IC will need to find ways to reach inside these communities as a dedicated diverse recruiting source. Research shows that the key to attracting and retaining Hispanic employees is to understand and value the diversity of experiences and perspectives within Hispanic culture.

Language barriers, smaller networking circles, and the perception of being ‘outside’ consideration for key positions are all seen as workplace challenges to achieving full potential for positions in the IC. According to some Hispanic participants, having an accent presents further obstacles to receiving the professional credit, intellectual levels and experience required for placement within the IC. For many first generation American Hispanic candidates, English may not be their first language. Although this may be seen as an added insight into cultural and language issues inherent with some target sets, in many ways, language bias may pose a communication challenge with leadership and peers and the ability to interact in the work environment even if they are successful at navigating the hiring process.

Security clearances are another obstacle of working in a cleared facility. Minority populations, specifically those who may be Heritage or second-generation applicants, are often subjected to longer processing times in the clearance process. The area of “Foreign Influence,” according to the “Adjudicative Guidelines for Determining Eligibility for Access to Classified Information,” is a significant factor when processing security clearance applications. Applicants with strong ties through family or heritage to other countries present intrinsic language and cultural skills both valuable and necessary to the business of intelligence; however, these same employees may feel fenced off from IC

“I don't think that the hiring teams were trained on understanding different cultures. Some of the individuals I saw in interviews were just spectacular, but (hiring authorities) didn't appreciate different cultures and what those individuals brought to the table. There were biases.” — African-American Male, NRO

“Latinos are not a homogenous group, but we are linked or bonded by family, religion, and Spanish language.” – Hispanic male, CIA
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employment because of lengthy adjudication processes and scrutiny necessary for background investigation requirements.

Additionally, Hispanic community respondents placed a heavy focus on the value of family. Understanding the Hispanic cultural histories, values, and beliefs in the importance of families is integral in being successful in outreach, recruitment, and retention. In essence, the recruiting team and the work environment become a family, where inherent trust and loyalty issues become equally as important.154

There are similar issues of trust that are especially important to Hispanic communities in a recruiting and sensitive compartmented environment. Traditional IC attitudes necessary to protect intelligence operations may be viewed with distrust, which may bleed into recruiting and other workplace interactions. A number of focus group participants mentioned that recruiting efforts are made at schools with large Hispanic populations; however, these efforts are sporadic and inconsistent. When working with the Hispanic culture, which places such heavy emphasis on building relationships of trust, recruiting efforts should make consistent visits and outreach to these schools annually. Additionally, supervisors and managers must have heightened awareness of fostering trust to achieve full potential and retention in this community.155

Like other minorities with strong familial ties to other countries, the Hispanic community finds security clearance processes especially cumbersome. However, in many minority work populations, especially those that are first-generation American or who have global family connections, the Hispanic community can be especially daunting. In fact, in some cases, the amount of paperwork involved becomes overwhelming to complete for submission and the recruiting opportunity is lost.

**Recommendations and Best Practices:**

**Cultural Sensitivities**

a. *Understand the important role of family in Hispanic culture for applicants.* If the IC seeks to recruit, advance, and retain diversity in appealing to the growing US Hispanic population, it is necessary to understand the effect job placement in the IC will have on the family and be sensitive to the unique cultural aspects and diversity within the Hispanic population.156 For a majority of the Hispanic community “family is the number one thing” in making employment decisions.157 This sense of family translates to the work environment as well. For retention, it is important to give Hispanic employees a sense of belonging to a greater whole. This can be affected by the establishment of Hispanic Employee Resource Groups (ERGs) to provide mentoring and coaching over the course of their careers in the IC.158 ERGs can be used effectively within the IC by incorporating regular briefings from, and notes and comments regarding ERGs and items of interest at staff meetings, director’s meetings and employee gatherings to emphasize the role of cultural sensitivities and awareness as part of the daily routine within the IC. Daily emphasis of these issues raises Hispanic employees’ role within organizations beyond annual heritage celebrations or annual diversity initiatives.
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b. **Incorporate appropriate employee cultural representatives into the recruiting process.** ERGs are not the only opportunity to bring cultural awareness into the work environment or into the recruiting process. By incorporating Hispanic employees (or African-American or Asian, etc.) into recruiting events at areas where there are expected applicants from these demographics aids in building trust and credible experiential information. According to research conducted by River and Rogers-Adkinson in 1997 and by Clutter and Nieto in 2009, understanding of cultural elements of the Latino culture can aid in the recruiting in inclusion of Hispanic (Latino) applicants and incumbent employees.159 The same would be true for cultural sensitivities particular to the African-American or Asian communities.160

c. **Continue efforts to establish trusted relationships with diversity-rich schools.** Successful recruiting efforts require consistent on-going attention to the development of trusted relationships between IC recruiting teams and the schools and communities in which they are based. Many minority cultures remain skeptical of government agencies as employment options. Research shows that racial minorities may prefer private sector employment because they consider government jobs as limiting career opportunities, or they do not perceive government jobs as improving the socioeconomic mobility, or because they might have an inherent distrust of the government in general.161 By engaging with specific schools on a regular, on-going basis, IC recruiting teams can gain credibility with school officials and prospective candidates. It would also allow the IC, in general, and agency recruiting teams, specifically, to establish credible relationships with an applicant’s family, if applicable, or his/her ‘greater’ family – that is, the “community of trust” (e.g., counselors, faculty, peer groups, etc.) developed at the collegiate level. This effort will take commitment on the part of IC Human Capital to maintain a presence and to staff recruiting events at these schools with diverse recruiting teams to emphasize the importance of diversity in the IC.

---
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The current IC diversity environment, as highlighted in the most recent Annual Demographic Report, shows a continuing trend in difficulties retaining minority employees in the mid-career levels, which generally refers to levels GS-9 through GS-13. Admittedly, there are issues with the advancement in this area for all employees. However, it is worth noting that in addition to the difficulties of advancement experienced by all employees, underrepresented groups likely experience further potential barriers to advancement due to smaller mentor groups, unconscious bias in promotion boards, limited opportunities due to physical accommodations, etc. Creating an environment that promotes advancement of targeted demographic groups allows for potentially increased retention during this critical career stage.

Based on the data collected across agencies, analysis of advancement in the context of workplace diversity and inclusion is broken down into three subcategories: promotion/opportunities, mentoring, and key assignments/joint duty assignments/career development. Each of these subcategories is crucial to fostering a diverse and inclusive work environment in the IC. Following in Figure 14 is a summary table of the key advancement findings and recommendations, outlined according to the subcategories identified for this study:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advancement</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Promotion / Opportunities</td>
<td>Emphasize the importance of developing Individual Development Plans (IDPs) for all employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promotion / Opportunities</td>
<td>Ensure that all new managers/supervisors, rather than primarily Senior Leadership, receive proper training in providing performance feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Re-establish/re-emphasize existing Mentor Programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Make mentoring programs inclusive – not just for new or rising employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Key Assignments / JDA / Career Development</td>
<td>Provide clear definitions, selection policies and guidelines on key assignments, Joint Duty Assignments and training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Key Assignments / JDA / Career Development</td>
<td>Apply policy guidelines fairly to the selection processes involved with JDA and training selections, communicating decisions to workforce in a timely manner to avoid perceptions of favoritism or secrecy in process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Key Assignments / JDA / Career Development</td>
<td>Implement guidelines of re-integrations following the completion of JDAs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14. Advancement Findings and Recommendations Summary Chart
Promotion/Opportunities

The effects of clear career paths on employees is unmistakable. Pathways to leadership and promotion opportunities are incentivizing and motivating. In fact, according to Victor Lipman, when employees are presented with tangible goals to work toward, they tend to affiliate more with the place of work. Likewise, employees tend to be less motivated and less focused without clear progression plans. For all the ways an employee can be motivated to produce and retain employment, “career advancement is an especially powerful one.” Talented people want to do a good job; they want to strive to improve; they want to get ahead. They want that improvement to lead them up a career ladder. Career progression is a tangible sign of their hard work. Researchers Amabile and Kramer agree with this view, saying that “the power of progress is fundamental to human nature.”

Focus group participants from multiple agencies, including several from DIA, expressed frustration in the lack of clear career progression plans and milestones. The career or Individual Development Plan (IDP) is intended to provide a tool to assist in career and professional development with the purpose of reaching short and long-term career goals. When used correctly, IDPs are seen as outlines of the steps toward attaining career milestones and aides in improving current job performance. IDPs are a clear investment from leadership in the value of the employee. However, the extent to which IDPs are effectively being used by supervisors and management across IC elements varies. The result is that employees often feel a lack of oversight or concern for their personal careers. Issues with IDPs seem to been systemic process issues that affect all employees within the community; however, it warrants noting that these issues may be experienced more often by underrepresented groups than by majority populations of employees, due to smaller networks and peer groups and more limited opportunities for mentorship.

Recommendations and Best Practices: Promotion/Opportunities

a. Emphasize the importance of developing Individual Development Plans (IDPs) for all employees. The purpose of IDPs is to give employees feedback and direction to manage their careers with a clear knowledge of the ‘next step.’ Specific emphasis should center on the cultural sensitivities noted previously mentioned in the Recruiting section of this paper. Certain
demographics (e.g., Hispanic employees) may have cultural difficulties in speaking openly with figures of authority. Additionally, there should be avenues developed where all employees can give candid and anonymous constructive feedback on both the IDP process and its execution. Multiple comments from focus group participants noted the perception of retribution when honest feedback on an IDP was given. Hold leadership responsible for IDP development and maintenance for all employees.

b. **Ensure that all new managers and supervisors, rather than primarily Senior Leadership, receive proper training in providing performance feedback.** New manager training on the effectiveness of endorsed techniques of employee management will lend value to employee efforts and validity to IDPs. According to Lipman in his essay on developing employees, organizations spend inordinate amounts of time and money on crafting ‘Senior Leadership’ courses and venues, but most of their employees are subject to the management techniques of low- or mid-level management. These are the managers who will make a difference in the workplace perceptions of new and rising employees.

### Mentoring

Career development and mentoring are critical for intelligence-employee advancement across the IC, especially among minority, female, and disabled populations who do not necessarily benefit from traditional, predominantly white male mentoring networks. In this instance, social dominance theory helps explain many of the IC challenges in advancement, mentoring, and promotion experienced by women, minorities and persons with disabilities. Input from participants can explain how social dominance factors into their ability to establish mentoring relationships within the IC. Because Caucasian males are in a majority within the general employee population and certainly within the senior population, they are more likely to seek out and establish mentoring relationships with other Caucasian males—employees with whom they can most closely identify as ‘looking like them’ and being closest to their social/organizational placement. In contrast, women, minorities, and persons with disabilities—groups with presumably lower rank and less authority in the organization—reject others from lower ranked, less authority groups. As seen in the IC, this theory reveals why it is more difficult for women, minorities and persons with disabilities to establish these crucial mentor relationships.

There is a perception that mentors and mentees tend to be of the same demographic group (i.e., white males tend to mentor other white males). This can be problematic for rising minority employees who see a lack of representation (and potential mentors) at more senior levels. Indeed, one agency’s FEORP statistics indicate that over 80% of mentees and over 90% of mentors are white males. One African-American female participant noted that part of the problem is that many managers do not know what
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mentorship is, and what it is intended to do. This participant noted that often, it is managers who are hindering their employees from getting the training and career development needed to advance. While it might be difficult for management to temporarily lose a top-performing employee in the short term, the long term gain of setting up a talented individual for success in their career should be worth the investment to the IC.

In addition to mentoring guidance, the lack of constructive critical feedback is also an aspect of the IC element culture that is potentially damaging to both employee performance and diversity efforts. Optimally, this type of feedback is usually given to an employee following career board or selection processes. For example, the ODNI formal vehicle for this type of information and career guidance is the Career Advisory Board (CAB), providing counselling and feedback meant to guide employees as they progress through their employment careers.

Unfortunately, for women and minorities, receiving guidance from formal vehicles like the CAB, and other similar infrastructures throughout the IC, if it is received at all, can be a double-edged sword. In her work on Criticism and Ineffective Feedback, Kate Heddleston found that critical feedback is bad for a myriad of reasons. First, people have strong, negative reactions to criticism regardless of their gender, race, or age. Additionally, people's performance worsens when they are given critical feedback. They also end up resenting the person criticizing them, even if the criticism is technically correct or kindly meant. Finally, researchers found that criticism is disproportionately given to women and minorities during performance reviews, resulting in an uneven distribution of critical feedback in the workplace that harms diversity. If criticism were applied equally to all employees in the workplace, then there wouldn't be a diversity issue with critical feedback. Unfortunately, women are given more criticism in employee feedback and performance reviews than men.

In a recent study by Kieran Snyder, performance reviews were gathered from over 180 people and reviewed for their level of critical feedback. The findings showed that 87.9% of women's employee reviews had critical feedback compared to 58.9% of men's reviews—a statistically significant difference. Additionally, 76% of criticism towards women included personal criticism, e.g. things like "you can come across as abrasive sometimes." By contrast, less than 2% of criticism targeting men was personal in nature. Similarly, Heddleston further emphasizes that giving more critical feedback to a particular
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group can have dire consequences. If criticism causes resentment and can worsen a person's performance on the criticized task, then it is no longer just an issue of coworkers and managers being "not as nice" to particular subsets of people. The fact that women receive more critical feedback than men could materially damage their performance as a group. At the very least, it could make it look like women resent feedback more than men when they simply resent criticism, which men equally resent. If critical feedback is targeted towards certain groups more than others, it has the potential to cause systematic changes in behavior in that group by engendering resentment and potentially worsening the criticized behavior. Removing the uneven distribution of criticism in employee feedback is critical to creating an environment that fosters diversity.  

**Recommendations and Best Practices:**

**Mentoring**

*a. Re-examine/re-emphasize existing Mentor Programs.* Adopt best practices from industry that can be applied to IC elements. According to Dobbin’s opinion in “Best Practices or Best Guesses? Assessing the Efficacy of Corporate Affirmative Action in Diversity Policies,” formal mentoring programs “can level the playing field, giving women and minorities the kinds of relationships that white men get through the old-boy network. Mentoring programs match aspiring managers with senior mentors, with the two meeting for career counseling and informal advice.” Consider, for instance, implementing two-pronged mentoring programs: one mentor from the same demographic group as the mentee, and one mentor from outside the demographic group of the mentee. In addition, according to Erickson’s Model for Effective Mentoring, there are four qualities of good mentorship programs:

- Create a ‘gift’ culture – that is, make mentoring programs voluntary, encouraging all employees to give freely of their time and insight to help colleagues.
- Address specific work needs – start with a specific project or professional goal that one person has and to which another person can contribute. This will establish an initial mentoring relationship that can grow to cover more aspects.
- Put the onus on the mentee – mentees should seek out mentor(s) if and when they’re needed. The most effective approach is to supply the mentee the names of two or three persons willing to mentor. The employee then has the responsibility to seek out the advice/mentorship.
- Make it two-way – encourage more experienced employees to seek out rising employees with specific questions or advice in the other’s areas of expertise, such as IT or social media issues. Research shows this adds value over a traditional mentoring relationship.

*b. Make mentoring programs inclusive – not just for new or rising employees.* Mentoring opportunities should not just be a program providing guidance and career advice for new hires and rising employees. Rather, mentoring should be open at all levels, providing guidance through informational relationships, customized to individual needs. According to DeLong, et al., mentoring programs were a casualty to hyper-competitive work environments, and, in the case of the IC, rapid
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growth following September 11. These programs became too time-intensive when senior and mid-
level leadership were consumed with imminent threats and agency growth precluded establishing
work environments with seasoned managers.  Mentoring programs exist in most IC agencies with
varied success. These relationships should be re-evaluated and re-established to determine the most
effective means to include all employees, even the most senior, who can, instead of career
progression, seek advice on how to approach, mentor and supervise other segments of the employee
population.

Key Assignments/Joint Duty Assignments/Career Development

Key or developmental assignments are crucial for advancement within the IC. Having the right
experience lends weight to an employee’s credibility for leadership and managerial skills when dealing
with specific and time-sensitive intelligence needs. This can also be said for assignments that are more
operationally focused as they tend to add more quantitative value to an employee’s résumé. Choosing the
right developmental assignment, as well as being selected for that position, allows the employee to
develop the critical skills necessary to operate in a dynamic environment. These assignments are used by

supervisors when determining lead employees on team assignments, by seniors when determining
rotational assignments and by promotion boards when determining promotions and potential for retention.
It is sometimes difficult, from the perspective of entry and mid-level employees, however, to determine
which opportunities present the best potential for development. A good peer and mentor network, solid
input, and professional feedback from supervisors and entities like the CAB are integral to this process.

The Civilian Joint Duty Program began as a phased-in, mandated-ODNI program in 2007. It was intended
to ensure that future intelligence leaders understood the complexity of the Intelligence Enterprise. Joint
Duty Assignments (JDA) are considered essential to IC agencies at maximizing employee overall IC
mission awareness as well as being mandatory for promotion to senior-level assignments. Issues with
JDAs seem to be systemic process issues that affect all employees within the community; however, it
warrants noting that these issues are felt more strongly by women, minorities, and persons with
disabilities—with more emphasis on their career progression—than do the majority populations of
employees due to their smaller networks, peer groups and opportunities for mentorship.

According to participants, the process for determining key assignments for advancement is not always
streamlined or easily understood by the IC workforce. It is, they report, often unwieldy and difficult to
navigate. Selection for developmental positions and progression through multiple assignments is viewed
as an integral part of meeting qualifications for promotion and advancement within the IC. However,
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guidance varies by IC element and specific JDA-coded billet, with some assignments being more beneficial to career progression than others. Many participants in the focus groups were not aware of a specific definition of what constitutes joint duty. A lack of clear understanding of the process, requirements or definitions of joint duty assignments has led to a general sense that JDAs are not consistently credited. According to participants, the employees' home organizations determine whether joint duty credit will be given for a particular assignment, and some noted that this seemed arbitrarily assigned. While certain senior interviewees did not see any one particular path being required for advancement within the IC, other interviewees and focus group participants presented strong statements that particular assignments, such as Chief of Staff positions, for example, were necessary for advancement. However, unlike JDAs, serving as a Chief of Staff is not codified as a requirement for advancement to the senior executive ranks, thus creating employee confusion.

Although this may be interpreted as a process issue that all IC employees must contend with, it is worth noting that women, minorities and persons with disabilities might be more affected by limited opportunities to lobby for or negotiate with seniors and peer groups due to limited available mentors and smaller professional networks. Disabled employees have an even smaller mentorship circle available for guidance on particular assignments that might be available, career-enhancing and provide reasonable accommodations for their specific physical limitations.

JDAs are important across IC elements. At FBI, for instance, a senior African-American male interviewee reiterated the need for certain FBI employees to have developmental assignments and experiences. He suggested that these kinds of experiences are not just important for the general workforce, but Special Agents, who have traditionally had very regimented career paths, can benefit as well. This is especially important given FBI's national security mission. He noted that one of the biggest challenges is getting joint duty experience ‘credit’ in the FBI. Generally, when employees return from a JDA, all they are asked is, “where have you been?”

Interestingly, it was also perceived that, despite the emphasis on JDAs, only the work performed at the employee’s home agency is considered for career development and advancement purposes, not the employee’s entire career experience. This serves as a ‘mixed message’ to employees—that one has to serve on an approved JDA to gain promotion, but that, in reality, it takes time away from establishing bona fides and networks at the home agency.

Reintegration following a JDA was also noted to be difficult. Many participants expressed that they felt lost and dependent upon the goodwill of others to remember them and assist them in re-integrating. This reintegration issue appears across all studied demographics for this project, leading to the conclusion that reintegration following JDAs is an IC-wide systemic problem. It would be worth further consideration to determine if women, minorities and persons with disabilities feel the effects of this problem with more emphasis on their career progression than do the majority populations of employees.

I think one thing that I've learned (is) that men like to work with men. This can result in the exclusion of women from meetings, training, and other potentially career-enhancing activities. Men interact with women differently than they interact with other men.” – African-American Female, FBI

“My SES (male) thought the training would be too hard for me. Hearing that only challenged me further to succeed.” – African-American Female, DIA
Recommendations and Best Practices:
Key Assignments, Joint Duty Assignments and Career Development

a. **Provide clear definitions, selection policies and guidelines on key assignments, JDAs and training.** Employees across IC components seemingly do not have clear information on the JDA selection processes, the best key assignments for their specific career fields or best training offerings. Best practices, as cited in Gwen Moran’s article on ways to tell if your workplace is fair, suggest that IC and individual agency career guidance policies on selection processes for career-enhancing training and key assignments need to be updated and formally disseminated to all employees. Specific career paths need to have stated guidelines for what training and key assignments are necessary and which are beneficial for selection to the next grade. Reasonable accommodations should be considered for non-traditional or disabled JDA applicants. JDA guidelines and policies should be easily accessible and updated for all employees.

b. **Apply policy guidelines fairly to the selection processes involved with JDA and training selections, communicating decisions to workforce in a timely manner to avoid perceptions of favoritism or secrecy in process.** The concept of ‘fairness’ in the work environment is one that is closely monitored by all employees; however, from the perspective of minorities, women, and persons with disabilities, workplace practices—particularly selections for key assignments that could lead to promotion—are constantly under scrutiny to determine whether they are fair. According to contributing editor Caron Beesley at the US Small Business Administration, one of the key components to developing a sense of ‘fairness’ in the workplace is to provide easily-available governing policies on these types of career-enhancing decisions that employees can reference at will during their progress through the promotion process. Because there is widespread confusion on training and JDA selection, it would be worthwhile to distribute updated agency and IC-wide policies on accessing these programs and the standards for selection.

c. **Implement guidelines of re-integrations following the completion of JDAs.** It is important that a reintegration program be in place to bring returning employees ‘back into the fold’ after a (potentially) long external assignment. Reintegration is important to solidify the returning employee’s value to the home agency and to give credibility for the time spent at another agency. Emphasizing an employee’s worth is necessary for retention—returning employees bring back valuable lessons learned and established networks from other IC elements and should be credited with earned work experience gained during this period. Their time away may also highlight perceived deficiencies at the home agency leading to opportunities for improvement.
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“Work/Life Integration” is a concept that describes the relationship between an employee’s work and personal commitments. In the context of workplace diversity and inclusion, obtaining a successful balance in work/life integration is essential. When these two factors are in conflict, the employee may show symptoms of stress. Based on the data collected across agencies, analysis of work/life integration in the context of workplace diversity and inclusion is broken down into two inter-woven subcategories: flexible work arrangements and paid family leave. As discussed in the following section, these subcategories are crucial to fostering a diverse and inclusive work environment in the IC. Following in Figure 15 is a summary table of the key Work/Life Integration findings and recommendations, outlined according to the subcategories identified for this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexible Work Arrangements</th>
<th>Employees require greater control over when and where they work, and more supervisor support for their personal requirements, in order to reduce work-family conflict.</th>
<th>Within the limitations inherent with working in the IC, explore ways to design agency-wide flexibility (to relieve pressure for people who need it), without burdening those working conventionally, and without requiring individual employees to figure out alone how to balance everything.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid Family Leave</td>
<td>Paid parental leave was cited as the most important benefit to employee retention during times of work-life conflict.</td>
<td>Explore options for paid parental leave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to a new study published in *American Sociological Review*, seven out of ten American workers struggle to achieve an acceptable balance between work and family life. That number has been climbing over time, to a point where employees—especially those between the ages of 30 and 44—reported in this study feeling a chronic sense of being pulled in two different directions. In “Changing Work and Work-Family Conflict: Evidence from the Work, Family, and Health Network,” researchers asked what can be changed in the workplace to address this growing health and productivity problem. A problem that has been documented to increase hypertension, impair sleep, increase consumption of alcohol and tobacco, increase marital tension, and impair parent-child relationships. They found that by modifying factors in workplace groups or departments—factors such as increased schedule control and supervisor support—there is a way to move from individual accommodations that an employee negotiates with his or her supervisor, toward systemic change across the workplace that benefits all.

**Flexible Work Arrangements and Paid Family Leave**

Working within the IC, with its inherent security and facility requirements, presents unique challenges for employees trying to balance the needs of work and personal life. Several senior interviewees across agencies acknowledged these particular IC work/life challenges, and provided some of the ways that have been found to mitigate them. For instance, an SES in the NGA Human Resources Directorate highlighted that NGA, like other agencies, is in the process of re-vamping its part-time policies, allowing parents to go part-time for a while after a birth. Options for flexible work schedules, such as adjusted start/end
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workday times and alternate work schedules, she indicated, are also being increasingly explored. Several senior interviewees pointed out that there are substantial costs—both in terms of financial and mission impact—associated with any of these benefits. Still, many acknowledged that more needs to be done.

This topic resonated within the employee focus groups, with participants indicating that they would like to see more flexibility to better accommodate family needs. Several female participants spoke of the difficult decision to return to their agencies from maternity leave because of the lack of flexible work arrangements. Many thought about leaving the agency for industry positions with greater flexibility during this difficult period of transition. One participant shared an alarming trend: having unnecessary C-sections in order to qualify for more paid time off after a birth.

When asked what one policy change would most improve work life balance within the IC, the overwhelming answer from participants was paid medical leave. Although the IC has a policy of up to 12 weeks of unpaid medical leave, many participants expressed a strong lobbying for this leave to be paid.

Issues with work/life integration seem to be systemic process issues that affect all employees within the community; however, it warrants noting that these issues may be experienced more heavily by underrepresented groups, such as women, who more often have primary caregiver responsibilities. In discussions of the gender wage gap, the “Motherhood Penalty” refers to the theory that supposedly women drop out of the workplace to be mothers and lose tenure and experience and often reenter at a lower level or take more flexible (and often lower paying) jobs to allow for more time to parent. This could account for much of the wage gap between men and women.179 However, recent research suggests that it is just the idea of being a mother that leads to workplace discrimination against women. Being seen as a mother leads to perceptions by management and colleagues of less commitment to the job or less

The ability to put in long hours. This research demonstrates conflicting societal attitudes relating to work/family responsibilities and roles, and highlights the stereotyping and discrimination towards women endemic in the workplace following motherhood.\textsuperscript{180}

The complex topic of work/life integration led to a lengthy discussion in many of the focus groups and interviews, and participants referenced some possible options for reducing work-life tension, such as telecommuting, supervisor empathy, flexible or reduced hours, part-time work, job sharing and paid parental/family leave. However, the general focus group participant response was a sense of leadership ambivalence and lack of agency commitment to resolving these issues.

### Recommendations and Best Practices:

**Flexible Work Arrangements and Paid Family Leave**

a. **Within the limitations inherent with working in the IC, explore ways to design agency-wide flexibility** (to relieve pressure for people who need it), **without burdening those working conventionally, and without requiring individual employees to figure out alone how to balance everything.** Using the approach suggested in the *Changing Work and Work-Family Conflict* study, agencies could migrate from the view that work-family conflicts are solely employees’ individual, private troubles, and explore ways to resolve them *systemically* with a broad-based shift in organizational approach and management leadership. By allowing employees greater control over when and where they work, and more supervisor support for their personal requirements, this study suggests that employees can experience a significant reduction in work-family conflict.\textsuperscript{181}

b. **Explore options for paid parental leave.** Paid parental/family leave options that have been proposed at the state-level or that have been successful in industry, such as employee commitment to stay with the agency a certain length of time following the paid leave (similar to time requirements post employer-paid graduate school programs), or pre-funded employee payroll deduction programs, ought to be fully examined within the context of financial cost, applicable laws, and validity to the IC.
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6. FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS – PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Despite relatively low numbers in the workforce metrics, persons with disabilities make up a larger percentage of the workforce than expected. A disability can happen to anyone, at any point in life, and is the one variable that crosses all demographic lines. Greater diversity exists among persons with disabilities than for any other demographic group, but they may be the least understood by society at large, and by extension, by decision makers and the general workforce within the IC.

Based on the data collected across agencies, analysis of persons with disabilities in the context of workplace diversity and inclusion is broken down into four subcategories: facilities and assistive technologies; the employment cycle: recruitment, career development and advancement; the reasonable accommodation process; and self-reporting of disabilities. As discussed in the following sections, each of these subcategories is crucial to fostering a diverse and inclusive work environment in the IC. Following in Figure 16 is a summary table of the key Persons with Disabilities findings and recommendations, outlined according to the subcategories identified for this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons with Disabilities</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Participants admitted a lack of personal awareness of the challenges faced by persons with disabilities in the workplace, as well as their own inherent biases toward disabilities.</td>
<td>Educate the workforce about disability issues. Allow open access to the IC EEOD’s disability training courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Barriers</td>
<td>There exist certain physical barriers within the IC workplaces, particularly at older sites.</td>
<td>Perform physical site surveys to immediately address physical access issues. Include persons from the disabled community to participate in the identification and solution process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement - JDAs</td>
<td>Disabled employees noted the difficulties in JDA selection and assignment are compounded when there is little information on what reasonable accommodations are available.</td>
<td>Define a more structured process within the IC to coordinate reasonable accommodations for employees moving from one IC agency to another for new employment or JDAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing support</td>
<td>Support resources for persons with disabilities is lagging behind need.</td>
<td>Identify additional resources to address the critical need for sufficient staffing to accommodate employees with disability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16. Persons with Disabilities Findings and Recommendations Summary Chart

Note the following statistics for persons with disabilities:

- In 2013, an estimated 10.8% of persons between the ages 21-64 for all races and ethnicities in the United States reported a disability.182

---

• More than one in four 20 year-olds today will become disabled before they reach retirement age (2009 American Community Survey) 183

• More than 50 million (1 in 5) Americans over the age of five have some form of chronic physical disability. This number will continue to grow as the population ages (2000 US Census) 184

• 25 million Americans have difficulty walking and/or climbing stairs; and 18 million people have trouble lifting or grasping small objects (2000 US Census). 185

A reasonable accommodation within the structure of the IC, refers to “any change to the job, the work environment, or the way things are usually done that allows an individual with a disability to apply for a job, perform job functions, or enjoy equal access to benefits available to other individuals in the workplace.” 186

The IC strives to maintain full compliance with offering accommodations for persons with disabilities in accordance with Executive Order 13164. To further advance these efforts, in FY 2015 the IC EEOD designated a new Disability Program Manager position and selected an incumbent who entered the position in January 2016. While there are many general physical workplace challenges faced by persons with disabilities; highlighted here are a few that are unique to the IC.

Facilities and Assistive Technology

Although the IC strives to maintain full compliance with offering accommodations for persons with disabilities, focus group participants highlighted several areas where simply meeting the requirement was not sufficient. For example, although bathroom doors within certain agencies may in fact be ADA compliant, individuals in wheelchairs reported being unable to get through them. Similarly, physically disabled employees reported that some buildings are not equipped with evacuation sleds, as these may not necessarily be mandated. This study found that the level of accessibility within the IC varies greatly depending on work location. Many newer sites have been designed and built taking into account the accessibility needs of a diversely-abled workforce. However, other facilities within the IC operate from older locations, where re-designing structures to allow for greater accessibility creates structural challenges. Thus, access to restrooms, security checkpoints, and emergency evacuation procedures all present challenges to persons with physical disabilities working in these environments.

Another area of concern among participants with disabilities was the move to open air work spaces (e.g., low/no cube walls) which impacts hard-of-hearing employees who cannot clearly hear conversations with

“When I first came to the agency, in a wheelchair, the facilities weren’t there for me to function. I had to self-advocate. I couldn't use the restroom in my building. I had to go to another building to use the restroom.” – Disabled Male, NSA

“You can't go through the “man trap” gates…if you're a wheelchair user. The bathrooms at work, even the ADA bathrooms, have doorways that you're not able to get through in a wheelchair. The agency’s response is that [the doors] are within the law. You can be within the law, but if the people that need to [access the building or] use the restroom can't get through the door, then I think it's time to go a little above and beyond the minimum requirement.” – Disabled Female, CIA


the ambient noise, and may not be able to use voice recognition tools in the open spaces. Similarly, meetings by video teleconference bring together employees who might be geographically dispersed; however, individuals who are deaf or hearing impaired cannot effectively participate in this medium without assistive technology.

Many persons with disabilities report being able to perform the essential duties of their jobs with assistance from certain software or adaptive computer systems. However, given current security requirements, not all software and tools are readily adaptable. This has a real impact on employees who rely on these tools to do their jobs. CIA employees with disabilities reported that they are required to use a particular system on the job that is not compatible with assistive technology. Focus group participants reported slow updates and approvals for software that would allow persons with disabilities to better do their jobs. One focus group participant, for instance, reported that he/she is ineligible for further promotion because assistive technology cannot be used with a particular required system.

The Employment Cycle: Recruitment, Career Development and Advancement

One senior interviewee acknowledged that IC security requirements make for a particularly challenging workplaces for persons with disabilities, adding that agencies will work with disabled employees to carefully examine requirements and determine the types of accommodations that can reasonably be applied. This type of individualized examination is imperative as the IC competes for talent against industry positions that may offer more flexibility, assistive technology, and readily accessible facilities.

Another senior interviewee shared a longstanding view that IC agencies believe the exciting nature of the work brings people in to apply for employment. However, for employees with disabilities, the nature of the work may be overshadowed by the challenges of accessing highly secure environments that does not provide the use of current technologies inside the work spaces, thus creating a barrier to live and work independently. Employees with disabilities may also be specifically challenged by sitting for a polygraph. Participants expressed concern that certain disabilities, such as mobility limitations or respiratory impairments, may impact polygraph testing results. These conditions make it harder to sell the IC to talented disabled prospective employees. One senior interviewee with a disability expressed: “If you were a person with a disability considering employment within the IC, you would have to ask, ‘Why would I chose this?’”

Many employees with disabilities expressed frustration over their lack of inclusion in or access to networking events, career advancing positions, joint-duty assignments, mentoring programs, and leadership roles. One participant with a disability summed up this frustration well by sharing: “I’ve been dying to network. It’s hard to do as a deaf person. Who do I talk to? Who do I meet? People do so much incidentally in conversation, and I have to do it in writing. That's just my life – I’m left out.”
Attending networking or social events can be culturally important in the workplace. Employees often find ways to network at these informal events, which can lead to broader exposure to leadership for advancement opportunities. However, limited vision, limited mobility, and deaf and hard-of-hearing (DHH) employees may feel excluded from these events, given that they may not be able to navigate the space physically, or understand voices in rooms with background noise. Also importantly, several DHH participants reported being unable to get an interpreter for non-official work.

Persons with disabilities face additional challenges when considering Joint Duty Assignments (JDAs). In addition to the regular challenges of having to apply for and be selected for a JDA, there are the compounding requirements of having to secure accommodation for the disability at the other agency (e.g., software, tools, sign language interpreters, transportation). Accommodations made at the home agency do not automatically apply to the other agency, and not all agencies have the same approved assistive technologies. Limited transit options may exist for getting to certain IC work locations, and for moving between dispersed buildings. Employees with disabilities reported the challenges of initially having to figure out how to get to and from their home agency each day. With driving limitations, figuring out new transportation routes for short-term assignments compounds the difficulty. Together these challenges make completing JDA requirements more difficult for persons with disabilities, which may in turn limit upward career mobility.

Participants with a disability repeatedly expressed frustration over a lack of persons with disabilities in IC leadership: that while employees with disabilities could be found in more entry or support roles, it would be inspiring to see someone with a disability in a decision-making role, or one that could serve as a mentor.

The Reasonable Accommodation Process

Many focus group participants expressed that the Reasonable Accommodation process was not well-known within each agency. Some individuals requiring accommodation view the process as burdensome. To avoid a lengthy process, employees sometimes work informally with their supervisors to develop a beneficial understanding. But if granted outside the formal Reasonable Accommodation process, these understandings may not automatically transfer to the next assignment or supervisor. While work-arounds help in the short run, they can limit the disabled employee’s next career move.

An interesting point emerged through the collection of narrative data. Among employees with disabilities, the Reasonable Accommodation process was described as easier to navigate for those who have long-term disabilities, as they have had experience with the system, know the requirements, understand what’s needed and have learned how to ask for it. For the long-term disabled employee, it’s sometimes simply a matter of connecting with the right person to move through the process. By contrast, for those whose disability is new or short-term in scope, the situation can be much harder. Foremost, it’s psychologically hard. A newly-disabled employee may still be struggling to accept the disability,
reluctant to openly talk about it, and learning to articulate their needs to supervisors. These employees may try to hide their disability. Accommodating new disabilities seems to take more time and attention, which could be argued particularly impacts certain employee groups, such as newer hires or disabled millennials, and warrants further exploration.

It was also heard in the focus groups that there is a commonly-held misperception that the National Security Act outweighs the requirement to accommodate individuals under the Rehabilitation Act. “Not true”, according to an IC disability expert. “The National Security Act does not supersede the Rehabilitation Act or the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). There are only two reasons for the IC not to accommodate someone: undue hardship, and direct threat.”

Thus, while agencies may be adhering to both the letter and the intent of this law, the perception within the disabled workforce remains that agencies may be avoiding making the effort to accommodate certain disability.

Self-Reporting of Disabilities

Across the interviews and focus groups, participants expressed an unwillingness to self-report disabilities. According to a Virginia Commonwealth University study on employers’ attitudes towards people with disabilities, the type and severity of the disability may impact the extent to which persons with disabilities are included in the workforce. The study found that employers have greater concern about hiring and working with persons with mental or emotional disabilities than those with visible physical disabilities. These findings may explain why IC employees may be unwilling to self-disclose hidden disabilities.

Many minority participants in the focus groups shared that they decided not to self-report a disability to their agency. These participants commented that it goes against cultural norms to avail themselves of accommodations services, particularly in the case of hidden disabilities or mental illness (i.e., sleep disorders, attention deficits, chronic illness, PTSD, stress, etc.). Because these undeclared disabilities may still influence how the affected employees perceive the inclusiveness of the IC workplace, this issue warrants further research and consideration.

Recommendations and Best Practices:
Reasonable Accommodations

a. Further educate the workforce about disability issues. During the focus groups, participants expressed an awareness of the new disability training course offerings being developed by IC EEOD, and many expressed interest in participating in such training at all levels. Importantly,


participants often admitted a lack of personal awareness of the challenges faced by persons with disabilities in the workplace, as well as their own inherent biases toward disabilities. But resoundingly, the take-away from the focus groups was a strong desire at all levels to broaden the discussion of these issues and to work to remove these types of barriers, both physical and attitudinal.

b. Perform physical site surveys to immediately address physical access issues. From the narrative data collection, it was apparent that immediately addressing issues of physical access as they arise would lend stronger credibility to the IC’s stated commitment to being an inclusive workplace for persons with disabilities. By inviting and encouraging the physically disabled workforce to participate in this process – to voice concerns and to provide input into obstacles - a more generally accessible end result could be achieved.

Additional recommendations were offered by NSA’s Office of Disability Affairs, which have been included here:

c. Define a more structured process within the IC to coordinate reasonable accommodations for employees moving from one IC agency to another for new employment or JDAs. The JDA process was explored in detail in the “Career Advancement” portion of this report, with strong indication across all demographics that the process suffers from systemic issues. These issues which affect all employees may be affecting employees with disabilities to a greater extent, given the added complexities of physical limitations, lack of consistent access to technical tools, and greater reluctance to accept employees requiring accommodations into JDA assignments. Some of these factors might be reduced by structuring an IC-wide process to coordinate reasonable accommodations. This would assist employees with disabilities by providing a single go-to source for information on requirements and potential restrictions.

d. Identify additional resources to address the critical need for sufficient staffing to accommodate employees with disability. For example, NSA has substantially increased the number of Deaf/Hard of Hearing (DHH) employees over the last five years, but there has been no increase in the number of sign language interpreters.
The intelligence agencies and elements that comprised Phase III of this study each perform an important role within the IC; however, many consist of a comparatively small number of employees relative to the entirety of their workforce. While these elements expressed a desire to participate in this study, many indicated that they did not have the resources nor the ability to segregate their agencies’ demographic data in order to examine the intelligence component separately. For instance, while some elements were able to provide the requested data specific to their agency’s Intelligence component to facilitate the study, most Phase III elements reported that their aggregate data, such as the MD-715, would not adequately reflect the type of information needed for the purpose of this study since the intelligence component of the workforce information is not separate but is blended into that of the entire element’s workforce data. Likewise, while most Phase III elements were able to identify and provide Senior IC managers for individual interviews, the small size of these elements further limited the ability to obtain sufficient volunteers to participate in focus groups. Thus, many of the Phase III elements were limited in their involvement in this study. This led to a fragmented view of the ten elements that comprised Phase III. Given the variance in the data, this phase of analysis had to be handled differently. The research team still found some rich points in the data; highlighted here are a few stand-out points.

Notably, many of the issues highlighted in the Big Six Intelligence Agency analysis were found in the ten other IC elements as well. For instance, across all grade levels, the need for a more diverse and inclusive IC workforce was viewed as imperative, while at the same time, disappointment was expressed that the issues of bringing a more diverse workforce together in the IC were still pervasive.

Not surprisingly, across the work lifecycle of recruitment, advancement, and retention, many of the issues that were identified in the Big Six Agencies also arose in the 10 elements. Common issues continued to be heard, such as:

There is a lack of diversity at the senior level. Women, minorities, and persons with disabilities remain underrepresented in the formal power and leadership hierarchies of the IC elements. In general, the

189 Several Phase III elements, such as the Department of State Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR) and the intelligence components of the United States Air Force and the United States Navy, among others, have recently conducted their own internal barrier analysis studies. This study serves to compliment those efforts and to work in conjunction with the individual IC elements’ findings and recommendations.
pattern is one of declining minority representation as seniority/rank/grade level increases. Many senior interviewees from IC elements noted a spike in their mid-level minority representation, and credited it to increasingly focused recruiting and retention efforts to increase diversity among those poised to assume leadership roles. This was expressed by one senior interviewee at the United States Coast Guard who shared that the key for this diversity to be maintained is for this pool of demographically diverse employees to be promoted and retained.

There is a lack of transparency in employment practices. The study found a common perception that employment processes—from hiring, to performance evaluations, to promotions and awards, to selection for key assignments—are not transparent. Further, absent objective, realistic, transparent standards, IC elements expose themselves to the perception that employment decisions were made arbitrarily and therefore could adversely impact minority demographic groups. Conversely, there is also some sentiment among employees, particularly though not exclusively white males, that the IC’s focus on diversity in hiring and promotion decisions is lowering standards for selection.

Hiring and promotion practices are dependent on “who you know.” There is a perception at many of the IC elements that there's a pervasive "good old boys" network/culture that puts women, persons with disabilities, and especially minorities at a disadvantage when it comes to hiring and advancement. Participants from the United States Navy’s intelligence components and the United States Air Force’s intelligence components noted an internal cliquish atmosphere and suggested that the key to getting hired or promoted or selected for training is to have a relative or friend somewhere on the inside. It was further suggested that job descriptions are often manufactured to fit certain persons wanted for hire or promotion. As one African-American female employee stated, “The good old boy network is alive and strong at (this IC element).” This sentiment led minority participants to perceive that their qualifications did not matter; selections were made with a “like-me” preference.

Hiring and retaining minority employees is especially important for certain missions. For instance, at DHS, hiring and retaining Hispanic employees is especially important because border issues fall into the DHS portfolio. Low representation of women and Hispanics was noted as a particular problem at the El Paso office; a senior interviewee reported that there is only one Hispanic in a senior position, and only three women employees. According to this senior interviewee, DHS also wants to increase American Indian representation, but history makes it hard for the federal government to earn trust and build relationships with tribal governments and individuals.

Rising employees in minority demographics have difficulties seeking mentorship. Many participants across the other IC elements emphasized that the formal mentorship program within their element is haphazard, at best—and at worst, non-existent. Problems associated with the mentorship program (or lack thereof) were thought by senior interviewees to contribute to high rates of turnover; lack of minorities and females in higher office; and dozens of people vying for certain highly sought-after mentors. Also, the perception among employees seems to be that you can only seek out a mentor for career advancement purposes and not for other purposes (i.e., guidance on work/life balance, being a female in a predominantly male environment, etc.).

Employees have little trust in leadership. Across the IC elements, many of the participants voiced a distrust of the EEO process, other "processes" or "systems"—whatever they may be, senior leadership, and maybe also to a certain extent, their own peers. Because there exists a lack of women, minorities, and persons with disabilities in high visibility senior-level positions, many participants, such as the women interviewed at one of the military service’s Intelligence component, expressed distrust of leadership’s statements of diversity and inclusion as mission-imperative. Such pervasive distrust will be a challenge to overcome to help these under-represented employees believe that leadership is committed to their professional development.
Leadership sets the example. Other participants across the IC elements stressed the importance of strong leadership, saying that how their leadership acts sets an example for the rest of the organization. Under one particularly strong agency leader, a senior interviewee from the U.S. Treasury’s Office of Intelligence Analysis shared, “there was never any doubt about the mission and accomplishments”. This strong sense of identity and purpose trickles down and is felt at all levels, by all demographic groups.

These types of workplace issues appeared common across all IC components, though they manifested in unique ways within each IC element’s individual workplace culture. While this study was often unable to determine whether these negative perceptions corresponded to reality of practices, it was found that the perception in and of itself is relevant for the IC. Although it is unknown the extent to which these perceptions are based on actual differential treatment of minority demographic groups, they clearly represent impediments to the goal of creating a culture of diversity and an environment of inclusivity where all members feel equally valued, able to contribute, and encouraged to succeed.
In a world where “unpredictable instability” is the new normal, the case for diversity in the IC is clear. The U.S. faces a diverse array of complicated national security threats both at home and abroad. Countering such diverse threats requires a creative and dynamic IC capable of collecting and analyzing nuanced, multidisciplinary intelligence in order to successfully protect American lives and interests around the world. Research shows that committing to diversity and inclusion improves innovation, as well as team decision-making and problem solving. This is not lost on the 17 agencies that comprise the IC—each one has deployed a number of different initiatives aimed at cultivating a more diverse and inclusive workforce. However, despite these efforts, persistent workplace challenges continue to hinder women, minorities, and persons with disabilities in the IC.

This study focused on identifying and analyzing the diversity and inclusion perceptions of the individual and perhaps the collective attitudinal impact in the workforce and what current diversity research tells us about generating recommendations for possible approaches to ameliorate these problems. The study did not follow the standard practice of identifying triggers and barriers by comparing the statistical numbers or percentages from the previous year(s) to the current one. Rather, it took a different approach, shifting to a more workforce-oriented methodology. It was unique in that it examined the IC as an integrated entity and was entirely performed by outside consultants. Data came from statistics provided by IC agencies, as well as from one-on-one interviews and focus groups with employees who spoke candidly about their personal workplace struggles. These participants made it clear that while they are absolutely committed to the IC’s mission, they recognize that there is room for improvement with diversity and inclusion. An extensive review of agency data confirms these observations that IC diversity programs are falling short; a comprehensive review of applicable research and literature revealed a number of possible reasons why.

Research suggests that traditional diversity programs fail for many reasons. Too often, leaders implement aggressive diversity initiatives that are not rooted in empirical research. Not only do these policies fail to make organizations fairer for underrepresented groups, they alienate a substantial portion of the workforce, many of whom are in the best positions to effect change. This report suggests a number of recommendations for improving the IC’s diversity environment. IC leaders should consider taking a multi-pronged approach to implementing these recommendations and changes, with a focus on:

- **Awareness**: Leaders should continue to raise awareness of barriers in the workplace, ideally with empathy training combined with unconscious bias training and encourage managers and employees in a positive way to be conscious of and understand the concerns and frustrations of other demographic groups.
- **Exposure**: Leaders should seek to increase employees’ exposure to qualified managers and employees with diverse backgrounds, thereby positively impacting the way people think about those different groups and eroding currently-held stereotypes and unconscious biases.
- **Action**: Leaders can take action to increase exposure and modify the way they see others different from themselves by providing activities such as: highlighting positive, diverse role models in positions of leadership; getting involved with employee resource groups; implementing formal mentorship and shadowing programs; and more.
- **Social accountability**: Finally, leaders should encourage social accountability, rather than forced compliance, as a means of mitigating bias and improving diversity and inclusion. Social accountability encourages the use of such methods as diversity task forces comprised of volunteers and invitees from management and members of underrepresented groups to investigate potential barriers and come up with their own solutions. Instead of force-feeding
policies, management and employees become actively engaged in improving their work environment. This approach utilizes transparency to encourage effective actions by understanding and promoting peer successes.

Like other successful organizations, each of the 17 elements of the IC can achieve success in diversity and inclusion by treating the process as an enterprise change initiative linked to other critical mission priorities. Diversity isn’t about counting people, but rather embedding diversity and inclusion into every organizational process—from talent acquisition, to workforce development, to leadership planning, and more. It means engaging the entire workforce and ensuring involvement of senior leadership. If handled effectively, diversity will be less about compiling demographic statistics and more about making the IC a more dynamic and agile force capable of meeting the national security demands of a more global and interconnected world. Diversity initiatives must be strongly supported by research, implemented carefully, and then evaluated to ascertain their effectiveness. The findings of this report point to areas that would benefit from additional research to include conducting impact analyses on the implementation of recommendations contained in this study and further examination of existing programs currently underway at various agencies.
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APPENDIX A: FURTHER DETAILS ON FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Following is a summary chart of the thirty-six findings and recommendations of this report, outlined according to the six key variables and subcategories identified for this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Leadership</td>
<td>Managers and supervisors fail to provide the leadership necessary to foster a diverse and inclusive workplace.</td>
<td>Offer quality role models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Diversity Optics</td>
<td>Minority demographic representation in senior leadership is lacking.</td>
<td>Provide leadership education, mentorship opportunities and shadowing programs at lower and mid-levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Diversity Optics</td>
<td>Seeing someone from minority demographics in senior leadership is powerful and inspiring, and demonstrates an agency’s commitment to diversity.</td>
<td>Promote diversity at the top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Diversity Optics</td>
<td>Diversity in leadership helps attract a more diverse pool of applicants.</td>
<td>Identify a diverse array of aspiring leaders early on in their careers and nurture them to be prepared to eventually become senior leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Diversity Optics</td>
<td>“Token” promotions or appointments only serve to confirm negative stereotypes and alienate employees, and can compromise the mission.</td>
<td>Avoid &quot;tokenism&quot; in promotions and appointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Leadership Skills</td>
<td>Mid-level managers are viewed as lacking empathy for non-majority cultural experiences.</td>
<td>Offer empathy training as part of a comprehensive leadership education program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Leadership Skills</td>
<td>Mid-level managers often fail to address poor performance and workplace problems/inequities.</td>
<td>Invest in leadership training that promotes diversity and encourages cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 EEO/Diversity Leadership Practices</td>
<td>Diversity training, specifically the unconscious bias training, is well-intentioned but not sufficient and fails to impact long-lasting behavioral change.</td>
<td>Steer discourse about diversity and inclusion issues in a positive way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 EEO/Diversity Leadership Practices</td>
<td>Many grievances filed with the EEOD office are viewed as being ignored, or lead to retaliation from supervisors or co-workers.</td>
<td>Take steps to discourage retaliation and ensure, when possible, that the grievance process remains anonymous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 EEO/Diversity Leadership Practices</td>
<td>There is perception of widespread inconsistencies in how EEOD complaints are handled, and a lack of transparency throughout the grievance process.</td>
<td>Increase transparency and address perceived inconsistencies in the EEOD grievance process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A.1. Leadership Findings and Recommendations Summary Chart
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### Findings Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Culture and Work Environment</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Workplace Diversity</strong></td>
<td>There is a perception in the IC of disenfranchisement among women, minorities and persons with disabilities.</td>
<td>Reiterate the roles of diversity and inclusivity as integral parts of the IC mission execution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Workplace Diversity</strong></td>
<td>There is a general belief that diversity and inclusion are not fully integrated into the IC's daily environment.</td>
<td>Hold leadership and staff accountable for behaviors outside the scope of Agency and IC Diversity Policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Racial &amp; Gender Stereotypes</strong></td>
<td>Many employees feel their employment is defined by their stereotype (e.g., angry black woman, quiet Asian, etc.)</td>
<td>Foster inclusivity in the workplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Racial &amp; Gender Stereotypes</strong></td>
<td>Participant input showed that each demographic has cultural sensitivities that can govern their perception inside the work environment.</td>
<td>Conduct an element or agency-wide Cultural Audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Racial &amp; Gender Stereotypes</strong></td>
<td>Stereotypical perceptions of employees can inhibit advancement and retention.</td>
<td>Ensure leaders model diversity and inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Hierarchical Structures</strong></td>
<td>Hierarchical structured environments emphasize &quot;elite&quot; groups.</td>
<td>Emphasize top talent in all career paths of the IC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 Hierarchical Structures</strong></td>
<td>Perceptions of impenetrable elite groups leave under-represented minority groups without avenues to advance and participate.</td>
<td>Encourage communication and coordination of Agency work teams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure A.2. Organizational Culture and Work Environment Findings and Recommendations Summary Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment and Selection</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Diversity in Recruiting</strong></td>
<td>IC female, minority and disabled employees perceive recruiting efforts to be geared only to historical &quot;White male&quot; universities which perpetuates majority hiring practices.</td>
<td>Effectively communicate successes in diversity recruitment internally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Diversity in Recruiting</strong></td>
<td>Recruiting teams have limited commonality with perspective applicants at historically Black, Hispanic or Asian universities if they are composed of predominantly Caucasian team members. Minority applicants have to compete against the 'status quo bias' when competing for jobs against a predominantly white applicant pool.</td>
<td>Include additional representatives from minority groups on recruiting teams, which should also facilitate having multiple applicants from minority groups included in the applicant pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Diversity in Recruiting</strong></td>
<td>IC recruiting teams have difficulty establishing the IC as a viable career opportunity if they are only present at annual University Hiring/Job Fairs.</td>
<td>Partner with student organizations to attract minority candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Cultural Sensitivity in Recruiting</strong></td>
<td>Certain minority cultures (e.g., Hispanic Communities) require understanding of cultural sensitivities when considering job opportunities. Family plays a large role in job decisions.</td>
<td>Understand the important role of family in Hispanic Culture for applicants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Cultural Sensitivity in Recruiting</strong></td>
<td>There is a perception in some Hispanic Recruiting areas that the IC has no understanding of Hispanic culture or other Hispanic employees -- families want to think their family members will not be left without cultural support.</td>
<td>Incorporate appropriate employee cultural representatives into the recruiting process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Cultural Sensitivity in Recruiting</strong></td>
<td>Some Historically Black, Hispanic, Asian or Disabled Universities only receive IC recruiting teams sporadically. There is no effort made to build trusted relationships advocating the IC as a positive career.</td>
<td>Continue efforts to establish trusted relationships with diversity-rich schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure A.3. Recruitment and Selection Findings and Recommendations Summary Chart**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advancement</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Promotion / Opportunities</td>
<td>Women, minorities and persons with disabilities oftentimes feel that their career advancement/IDPs are not given enough effort by management. Because they have smaller peer networks and/or mentors who understand their specific issues, they often have no direction for advancement.</td>
<td>Emphasize the importance of developing Individual Development Plans (IDPs) for all employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Promotion / Opportunities</td>
<td>There is a noted lack of clear guidance, constructive feedback and career advancement pathways presented to women, minorities and persons with disabilities in the IC. Supervisors give insufficient feedback and at times, cultural biases are perceived or cultural sensitivities inhibit meaningful exchange with supervisors.</td>
<td>Ensure that all new managers/supervisors, rather than primarily Senior Leadership, receive proper training in providing performance feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mentoring</td>
<td>Mentorship programs are perceived as ineffective, particularly when there are too few volunteers of diverse backgrounds to act as mentors, and there is no guidance on how they are to be implemented.</td>
<td>Re-establish/re-emphasize existing Mentor Programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mentoring</td>
<td>There is a noted lack of mentors at the mid-levels which is especially felt by women, minorities and persons with disabilities who have fewer role models from similar backgrounds and smaller peer networks for advocacy.</td>
<td>Make mentoring programs inclusive – not just for new or rising employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Key Assignments / JDA / Career Development</td>
<td>There is a lack of understanding across the IC on the policies governing selection to JDAs or key assignments. With smaller peer networks and fewer mentors available with similar backgrounds, it is difficult for minority demographics to determine which assignments are beneficial or available.</td>
<td>Provide clear definitions, selection policies and guidelines on key assignments, Joint Duty Assignments and training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Key Assignments / JDA / Career Development</td>
<td>Employees perceive that selection for key assignments/JDAs is often pre-determined for ‘favored’ employees. Caucasian males rely heavily on their mentors to prepare and recommend them for these key positions; minority demographics don’t necessarily have the same contacts or preparation.</td>
<td>Apply policy guidelines fairly to the selection processes involved with JDA and training selections, communicating decisions to workforce in a timely manner to avoid perceptions of favoritism or secrecy in process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Key Assignments / JDA / Career Development</td>
<td>Although issues with JDA re-integration are felt by all employees, these issues are more keenly felt by women, minorities and persons with disabilities as they have smaller peer networks to advocate for them or mentors to guide them back into the home agency environment.</td>
<td>Implement guidelines of re-integrations following the completion of JDAs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A.4. Advancement Findings and Recommendations Summary Chart
## Work/Life Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees require greater control over when and where they work, and</td>
<td>Within the limitations inherent with working in the IC, explore ways to design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more supervisor support for their personal requirements, in order to</td>
<td>agency-wide flexibility (to relieve pressure for people who need it), without</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduce work-family conflict.</td>
<td>burdening those working conventionally, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>without requiring individual employees to figure out alone how to balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>everything.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paid Family Leave</th>
<th>Explore options for paid parental leave.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid parental leave was cited as the most important benefit to employee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retention during times of work-life conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings and Recommendations Summary Chart

### Persons with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants admitted a lack of personal awareness of the challenges</td>
<td>Educate the workforce about disability issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faced by persons with disabilities in the workplace, as well as their</td>
<td>Allow open access to the IC EEOD's disability training courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own inherent biases toward disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Barriers</th>
<th>Perform physical site surveys to immediately address physical access issues.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There exist certain physical barriers within the IC workplaces,</td>
<td>Include persons from the disabled community to participate in the identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particularly at older sites.</td>
<td>and solution process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Advancement - JDAs                                                      | Define a more structured process within the IC to coordinate reasonable        |
|                                                                         | accommodations for employees moving from one IC agency to another for new    |
|                                                                         | employment or JDAs.                                                          |

| Staffing support                                                        | Identify additional resources to address the critical need for sufficient    |
|                                                                         | staffing to accommodate employees with disability.                         |

### Findings and Recommendations Summary Chart

Each individual IC agency or element must define the approach that best addresses these findings within their own, unique workplace culture. How the IC as a whole addresses the findings that were uncovered in this study is crucial to improving both the perception of and the reality of workplace barriers. It will take extraordinarily strong leadership to implement change, and in turn very strong leadership from the individual IC elements for any real change to occur. As in any organization, the leadership of each element plays a vital role in setting the tone of the work climate. The leadership example must be mirrored by the individual managers and supervisors at the line-level within their respective IC elements who are in the most critical position to impact culture. The actions and behaviors of this middle-management level are crucial to implementing successful change initiatives. The IC will face significant challenges in leveraging the key leaders, middle managers, and advocates within each of the elements to achieve the necessary results.
APPENDIX B: FURTHER DETAILS ON PROJECT METHODOLOGY

The following offers additional details to the earlier discussion on the methodology that was developed and employed for data collection and analysis purposes in undertaking this study.

Development of Analytic Model. Initial analysis was focused on relevant organizational issues by using descriptive models from the organizational development field. Two existing organizational models were adapted for this effort: Marvin Weisbord’s Six Box Model and McKinsey’s Seven S Model.

Weisbord’s Six Box Model (Figure A.7), provides a descriptive model that is useful for examining the data from a larger systems perspective. This model considers six factors to examine the functions of an organization:

1. **Purposes**: What is our mission?
2. **Structure**: How do we divide up the work?
3. **Relationships**: How do we manage conflict (coordinate) among people? With our technologies?
4. **Rewards**: Is there an incentive for doing all that needs doing?
5. **Leadership**: Is someone keeping everything in balance?
6. **Helpful mechanisms**: Is there adequate coordination (e.g., information sharing, meetings, tools)?

![Weisbord Six-Box Model](image)

Two categories in the Weisbord model were not directly applicable for the purpose of this analysis. These categories were:

- **Purpose**: The Intelligence Community, and each of its elements, has a clear vision and mission.
- **Rewards**: the project scope was how diversity and inclusion affect all aspects of performance throughout the IC, rather than specifics about personnel systems.
Two modifications to the Weisbord model were made by adopting two categories from McKinsey’s Seven S model\(^\text{190}\) (Figure A.8), a value-based management model that describes how to holistically and effectively define an organization. The two categories adopted from McKinsey’s model were:

- **Skills**: the individual and organizational abilities
- **Style**: the culture and behavior of the organization

After integrating the most appropriate factors from the two models, the revised model, as shown in Figure A.9, created a structured analytic framework to highlight particular strengths and areas for improvement. Content analysis was used to extract key data points from the quantitative and qualitative data collected and placed them in the appropriate categories of the revised model.

\(^{190}\) McKinsey’s Seven S Model: http://www.reflectlearn.org/discover/frameworks
As the data analysis progressed, this integrated model was further adapted to highlight six major areas where the IC can take an integrated approach to advancing and retaining a diverse workforce. The following six variables are key to assessing the state of diversity in today’s IC environment. These variables include:

- **Leadership**
  - Diversity Optics
  - Leadership Skills
  - EEO/Diversity Leadership Practices

- **Organizational Culture/Work Environment**
  - Workplace Diversity
  - Perceptions of “Tokens and Quotas” – Racial and Gender Stereotypes
  - Hierarchical Structures

- **Recruitment and Selection**
  - Need for Diversity in Recruiting Sources
  - Need for Cultural Sensitivities in Recruiting

- **Advancement**
  - Promotion/Opportunities
  - Mentoring
  - Key Assignments/Joint Duty Assignments/Career Development

- **Work/Life Integration**
  - Flexible Work Arrangements
  - Paid Family Leave

- **Persons with Disabilities**
  - Facilities and Assistive Technologies
  - The Employment Cycle: Recruitment, Career Development and Advancement
  - The Reasonable Accommodation Process
  - Self-Reporting of Disabilities

**Content Analysis Part I.** Data points were reviewed from each interview and focus group question. Common phrases, words and themes were noted and tracked to see what key observations emerged. Collective data by agency or IC element was next reviewed. Commonalities were noted and tracked to see what themes emerged. Data was then reviewed according to groups of interest (women, minorities, and persons with disabilities) to see if observations or themes differed between question-level and full agency data.

**Content Analysis: Part II.** The data and findings were then placed into the larger organizational context of the agency or IC element. As much as possible, sources were noted (i.e., data report, interview, focus group). Some data naturally fell into more than one category. Coding and other techniques were used to avoid attributing specific experiences to any particular individual. This approach helped place the data in the larger agency and IC functioning and context, which led to findings, and eventually recommendations, that holistically address the IC’s need for useful insights on workforce diversity and workplace inclusion.
APPENDIX C: FURTHER OBSERVATIONS OF THE IC’S CURRENT DIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT: WORKPLACE CONCERNS SPECIFIC TO HISPANICS AND AFRICAN-AMERICANS

To add context and perspective to this report’s earlier section IV. Observations of the IC’s Current Diversity Environment, following is a summary of observations from the data analysis of responses by Hispanic and African-American employees to perceptions of workplace challenges. These trends were highlighted by the Hispanic and African-American participants in the study, collected through focus groups, interviews, and attendance at Employee Resource Group meetings, and are included here to provide context for the IC-wide observations found in this report.

Responses from the Hispanic Community within the IC Workforce

Recruiting, Hiring and Retention

**Recruiting and Education Qualifications.** Input from Hispanic participants expressed concern for the recruiting process being reflective of issues pertinent to the Hispanic community. Recruiting in Hispanic communities requires the establishment of trusted relationships—not only between the recruiting agency and the potential employee but also with the potential employee’s school representatives and even their family. These relationships cannot be established immediately and expected to be successfully formed after one recruiting visit to a historically Hispanic school. IC agencies and recruiting officials must make a multi-year investment in grooming contacts to act as Hispanic recruitment advocates. In the face of more lucrative opportunities—especially for high-demand qualifications (STEM)—the IC must be viewed as the more trusted option to potential candidates.

Career Development, Key Assignments and Advancement

**Recruiting and Education Qualifications.** Input from the Hispanic community responses also expressed concern for the process of career development within the IC. Language barriers, smaller networking circles, and the perception of being ‘outside’ consideration for key assignments are all seen as persistent challenges to achieving one’s

---

191 These responses were extracted from the data collected for Phase II of this study, which covered the Big Six Intelligence Agencies.
full potential in the IC. According to some Hispanic participants, having an accent presents further obstacles to receiving the professional credit deserved within the IC. With a smaller workforce of Hispanic employees, establishing and maintaining trusted networks is more difficult. Senior leaders from the Hispanic community are seen as an essential component to this equation. Hispanic leaders are viewed as a must for advocating for other rising Hispanic employees in order to receive the necessary visibility into advantageous Joint Duty Assignments, guidance on promotion packages and providing career advice on how to qualify for Service School recommendations. Without Hispanics in positions to influence these key advancement decisions, rising Hispanic employees may feel a loss of connection, a lack of attention to their advancement, and be more apt to leave the IC.

Equal Employment Opportunity, Culture and Inclusion

Family, Trust and Culture. Hispanic Community responses have a heavy focus on family.

Understanding the Hispanic cultural histories, values and beliefs in the importance of families is integral in being successful in reaching out and retaining this demographic inside the IC. The work environment becomes a family, where inherent trust and loyalty issues become equally as important.

There are additional issues of trust that are especially important to Hispanic communities in a sensitive compartmented environment. Traditional IC attitudes necessary to protect intelligence operations may be viewed with distrust, which may bleed into other workplace interactions. When working with the Hispanic culture, which places such heavy emphasis on building relationships of trust, supervisors and managers must have heightened awareness of fostering trust to achieve full potential and retention in this community. The lack of trust may
be impacting both recruitment and retention of Hispanic employees across the IC, as reflected in Figure A.10, which compares the Hispanic representation in the IC to other population benchmarks.

![Hispanic Representation in the IC Compared to Other Population Benchmarks (FY 2015)](image)

**Participation Limitations and Other Issues**

**Hispanic Under-Representation in Focus Groups.** As detailed in the methodology of this report, despite diligent efforts, Hispanics as a group were underrepresented in the study’s volunteers for focus groups. While a certain degree of this under-representation may be attributed to the low percentage of Hispanics in the IC workforce (according to the recently published ODNI 2015 Annual Demographic Report, the percentage of Hispanic employees in the IC workforce is 5.7%, 8.4% of the federal workforce, and 14.2% of the civilian workforce), there may also be other hidden underlying reasons for this lack of participation. Some Hispanic volunteers who did attend the focus groups expressed trust issues: would participation in the focus group be viewed negatively by their supervisor? Others may have declined to participate due to feeling that it would not make a difference. One Hispanic participant indicated that he had gone to previously held focus groups, and nothing had changed as a result.

Some Hispanic volunteers who did attend the focus groups indicated a reluctance to “check the race box” on EEO self-identification forms. Theories on why this IC trend exists vary, but what is clear is that it mirrors a broader social trend seen across industry that Hispanics sometimes avoid self-identifying race/ethnicity. Some within the Hispanic community, particularly Hispanic Heritage Americans, expressed reluctance to designate race/ethnicity because of skepticism over how the information would be handled: ‘Will it be used to discriminate against me?’ This concern seems to indicate that there is a perceived racial bias toward first-generation immigrants if they release this information. One interviewee in the study shared that she could “pass for white” and did not disclose her ethnicity until she’d reached a certain level of achievement in her career. Other indications are that the term “Hispanic” may be too broad—the community considers itself a very diverse mix of identities that may not ‘fit’ into one specific demographic box.

**Language Barriers.** For many Hispanic employees, English is not their first language. At times, there are struggles with translation and perception issues in the workplace because of this. Although this may be seen as an added insight into cultural and language issues inherent with some target sets, in many ways,
language issues pose communication challenges with leadership and peers and the ability to interact in the work environment.

**Clearance Issues.** Security clearance processes are cumbersome for everyone. However, in many minority work populations, especially those that are first-generation American or who have strong familial ties to other countries, like the Hispanic community, these issues can be especially daunting. Within the Heritage American/first generation community, there is a perception held of discrimination in the security clearance process because of the longer length of time it takes for cases to be completed. In actuality, this may not be discrimination, but rather a legitimate requirement: having to check additional foreign contacts of friends and family members requires, on average, an additional 6-8 weeks. Communicating this difference in expected length of processing time in order to set expectations appropriately continues to be a challenge.

**Responses from the African-American Community within the IC Workforce**

**Recruiting, Hiring and Retention**

**Recruiting and Education Qualifications.** A widely held perception among African-Americans across the IC is that recruiting efforts are focused on certain predominantly white schools and other predominantly white recruiting sources, while many African-American candidates get overlooked. Despite the IC highlighting increased efforts to visit HBCUs, some within the African-American community retain the perception that these visits are sub-par, or are handled in a way that minimizes their results. This perception is promulgated by the lack of African-Americans holding positions of seniority within the IC. Many expressed the dismal feeling of looking around their organization and finding other African-Americans only in lower level support positions.
Leadership’s repeated message of the importance of promoting diversity rings hollow. The impact of these visuals sends a far louder message of the relative importance, the perception of ability, and the probability of achieving certain positions for African-Americans within this environment.

**Leadership and Leadership Accountability**

**Workplace Environment.** African-American employees, like their Hispanic counterparts, repeatedly expressed issues of distrust of leadership. As the primary responsibility for fostering attitudes of inclusion and diversity rests with workplace supervisors and front-line managers, when employees experience less-than-optimal diversity or inclusion issues, they hold management responsible. Despite early-career optimism in agency leadership to build and endorse fair workplace environments, many African-Americans expressed a heightened sense of disappointment when those environments later demonstrated a perceived lack of accountability of leadership. To foster inclusion, managers need cultural awareness training and sensitivity to correctly gauge existing environments and the appropriate responses. Across the African-American community, like the Hispanic community and the IC workforce at large, passion for and commitment to mission resonated. Some within the African-American community seemed to hold the IC to a higher standard, and were therefore even more disappointed to come to the realization that the same societal inequities were mirrored within this workforce. The broken trust from this disappointment resonated among focus group participants.
While not an exhaustive list, this collection of findings serves to highlight some of the perceived workplace barriers faced by Hispanics and African-Americans employees. Individual IC agencies and elements are making efforts to address these challenges. Many have deployed a number of different initiatives aimed at cultivating a more diverse and inclusive workforce. However, despite these efforts, persistent workplace challenges continue to hinder Hispanics and African-Americans working in the IC today.

“I came in with a bunch of white males from the same school. During our first two months, one of them told me the branch chief walked up to him and told him they were going to promote him.” – African-American Female

“I have to be careful not to be perceived as an angry black man.” – African-American Male

“During my first two months, I was sitting at a desk. Two white females were behind me, talking. They were looking for a black toner cartridge. One said, ‘do you see any black ones?’ referring to the toner cartridge. The other one said, ‘No, we don't have any black ones here.’ and she was pointing at my back.” – African-American Female

“Here's the best retention tool DIA has: a poor economy. There aren't a lot of jobs out there and the other government agencies aren't hiring. DIA knows that. Where else are you going to go?” – African-American Male

“Everyone has an agenda or goals. But it is how we reach our goals that is very important. We can achieve our goals and help other people along the way. If you are in a leadership position, you should lead and be a mentor. [You should not] step on people to get where you want to get.” – African-American Female

“We had a division chief that recently came in and said "the good old boy system is gone." That means leadership was aware that there was a perception of a good old boy system. Well, it's not gone. It's still there. . . Why even invest any energy into making change?” – African-American Male

“Someone hung a (racially insensitive item in the workplace). A black woman came to me and said "I'm deeply offended by that." I tried to take it down, but it was up too high. I didn't know who put it up. I asked EEOD (for assistance with) the issue. EEOD responded and asked for details, but nothing further was done.” – African-American Female
APPENDIX D: FEDERAL EEO COMPLAINT PROCESS

Following in Figure A.11 is an overview of the federal EEO complaints process.

Figure A.11 Overview of the Federal Complaints Process
APPENDIX E: NOTIFICATION TO AGENCY LEADERSHIP

Following is the formal tasking notification for this project that was sent to Agency EEOD leaders. The names of individual EEO Council members and project team members and the dates of specific project actions have been removed.

Office of the Director of National Intelligence
Chief, Intelligence Community Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity
Washington, DC  20511

MEMORANDUM FOR: DISTRIBUTION
Subject: Analysis and Report of Barriers to the Hiring, Retention and Development of Women, Minorities, and Persons with Disabilities in the Intelligence Community

Background:
In 2014, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) updated the National Intelligence Strategy (NIS), which provides the IC with mission direction for the next four to five years. Within its framework, the NIS set a goal for the IC to “build a more agile, diverse, inclusive, and expert workforce”. Within ODNI, the IC Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity (EEOD) office conducts oversight and sets policy for the development and implementation of a broad range of initiatives and programs designed to foster fairness, equality, inclusion, and diversity across the IC. For the past 10 years we as a community have been responding to a Congressionally Directed Action to produce the “Annual Report on the Hiring and Retention of Minority Employees in the IC.” This is an IC-wide collaboration and integration of all 17 agencies and components accomplishments to identify areas of under-representation of women, minorities, and persons with disabilities.

To further these important goals and efforts of the IC, the ODNI EEOD office has commissioned [the project team] to conduct this project and produce a report to identify barriers towards hiring, retention and career development of women, minorities, and persons with disabilities, and develop recommendations for addressing any of these barriers and their impact to career advancement of these groups. The ODNI Office of IC EEOD requests your assistance in providing workforce data addressing IC diversity, to include women, minorities, and persons with disabilities. Your assistance is also requested in the identification of executive leaders for participation in structured interviews and encouraging workforce volunteers to participate in focus groups. Recipients of the finished report include the Director of National Intelligence (DNI), the IC EEOD and the members of the IC Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Council (here after referred to as the Council).

Guidance:

1. The documentation here listed should be provided to [Senior Advisor], the IC EEOD point of contact (POC) listed below. We request that the information supplied by agencies and components be in an unclassified format where possible and sent via the listed POCs unclassified email address. If information cannot be supplied in an unclassified format then those with access to secure email systems should send responses via IC E-mail; others should send via courier to the address indicated.

   • MD 715 reports (2009-2014)
   • Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plans (2009-2014)
   • Federal Employment Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP) Reports (FY09-FY14).

If your agency or component does not produce FEORP Reports then please disregard.
• Any individual agency or component studies conducted on women, minorities, or persons with disabilities (e.g., a Barriers Analysis study)

2. The membership of the Council is requested to function in the capacity of the agency and component POCs for this project. In order to conduct this Report we request the Council members perform the following:

• Send notification out to your agency or component’s leadership for endorsement (the agency’s Director or Deputy Director) and explain the details of the study (a sample letter is included as attachment A)

• Send notification out to your agency or component workforce to explain the study, and generate interest in it and request volunteer participants for the focus groups (a sample letter is included as attachment B)

• Identify two senior-leaders in your agency and notify them that they will be contacted by [the project team] to request each participate in 1-hour personal interviews for the study. You (or your designated representative), as Council representative for your agency or component will also be expected to participate in a 1-hour personal interview.

3. The Project Team will coordinate one-on-one with each identified individual to arrange interview times appropriate for their schedules. Two or three contractors along with [Senior Advisor] from the IC EEOD will be present during the focus group and interviews. One contractor will facilitate the discussion, and the other(s) will take notes to produce a reasonably accurate record of the information discussed. The study team will categorize or “code” like responses to remove details that might point to a specific individual. There will be “no” personally identifiable information captured on individuals who participate in the study.

4. The membership of the Council is requested to encourage focus group participation and to provide contact information for volunteers to contact the contracting team-lead directly at: [xx] or [xx] to elect their interest in participating. In smaller agencies or components, it is possible that there may be a less than desired number of volunteers to ensure the focus group is truly representative of the desired demographic. If additional representation is needed it is requested that all employee names representing the underrepresented demographic be supplied to [the project team] when or if possible to enable [the project team] to contact these individuals directly to determine additional final participants. Participation in the focus group is a completely voluntary process and the method of contact employed by [project team] would be a group email, sent out to every name supplied by that agency or component, simply reinforcing the request for volunteer participants. There will be no coercion to participate applied in this process.

5. There are no penalties for participation or non-participation.

6. Focus groups are to be held offsite (but near the workplace) to encourage participants to be open.

7. Participants’ time is to be considered official work time and is reimbursable just as in participating in a working group, etc.

8. Focus groups will be conducted separately for Managers (GS-13 to GS-15) and for Non-Managers (GS-12 and below).
Suspense Dates:

The requested agency or component reports (e.g., MD-715, FEORP) and data must be provided to the IC EEOD no later than [date].

A [project team] member will contact and meet with each agency and component POC within 2 weeks of this notification. The purpose of this meeting is to allow an open-forum for questions or concerns surrounding this study and our interactions with internal personnel.

A [project team] member will contact each Council member and designated senior-leader between [dates] to schedule a personal 1-hour meeting at a time convenient for both parties. The interview will be conducted between [dates] (for ODNI) and [dates] (for the remaining 16 organizations).

The initial focus groups and interviews will be conducted for ODNI and will be conducted between [dates].

Interviews and Focus Groups for the remaining 16 organizations will begin [dates] and completed by [date] so all participants must have been identified in advance to enable scheduling.

Teleconference:

At the [date] IC EEOD Council teleconference, [Senior Advisor, IC EEOD] along with representatives from the [project team] will be online to answer any questions related to the study.

Points of Contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ODNI         | Chief, IC EEO and Diversity (IC EEOD)  
               | Deputy Chief, IC EEOD |
| Air Force    | Director, Air Force Equal Opportunity  
               | DCS Manpower, Personnel and Services |
| Army         | Director For EEO Modernization  
               | Army EEO and Diversity Initiatives |
| CIA          | Deputy, Diversity and Inclusion Office  
               | Deputy Director, Diversity and Inclusion Office  
               | Director, Office of EEO |
| Coast Guard  | Chief, USCG Intelligence and Workforce Management Division |
| DEA          | EEO Officer |
| DIA          | Chief, Equal Opportunity (EO) |
| DHS          | Deputy Officer, Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties & Director EEO and Diversity Programs |
| DOE          | Director, Human Resources Analyst  
               | Chief of Office |
| FBI          | Assistant Director, Office of EEO Affairs  
               | Section Chief, Human Resources Division, Diversity & Inclusion Section |
| Marine Corps | Assistant Director for Workforce Development |
| Navy         | Chief, Human Capital Office  
               | EEO Officer, EEO and Diversity Office |
| NGA          | Director, Office of Diversity Management and EEO |
The **IC EEOD** point of contact is [Senior Advisor], IC EEOD. Please contact him directly for clarification on this task. Submissions should be addressed to:

Senior Advisor, IC EEOD  
IC Equal Employment Opportunity & Diversity  
Office of the Director of National Intelligence  
Tech Building, Room 210-L  
Washington, DC  20511

Business Support Analyst  
Tech Building, 200-J-02  
Office of the Director of National Intelligence  
Washington, DC  20511

We look forward to working with you on this project and with your assistance we will have better enabled the IC to realize the NIS goal to “build a more agile, diverse, inclusive, and expert workforce.”

Sincerely,

- signed -  

Chief, IC EEOD
APPENDIX F: POOL OF QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUPS

The following is a representative list of questions used during the semi-structured interviews with senior leadership, the Employee Resource Group (ERG) meetings with individuals from under-represented demographic groups, the additional non-senior interviews, and the focus groups with the workforce to discuss each stage of the employment process. These questions were designed to elicit experiences and perspectives regarding women, minorities, and persons with disabilities.

Analyzing Employment Processes

**Senior Leadership Questions**

1. How does EEO compliance differ from workforce diversity and inclusion initiatives?

2. What does the current representation of women, minorities, and persons with disabilities within the IC look like?
   a) Are workforce participation rates substantially similar to those rates in the relevant civilian labor force (RCLF)?
   b) Where there are variations, in what specific area(s) is the variation occurring (e.g., particular job category, particular grade, particular Directorates/Offices, etc.)?

3. Are you familiar with any specific examples of a member of these diverse groups felt excluded from the [IC/Agency]’s important mission? How did you learn of these instances?

4. In what ways are senior executives and managers held accountable for supporting the DNI’s vision for a diverse workforce in the IC?

5. What issues or challenges, if any, do you believe the IC should address related to recruiting, hiring, retention, and advancement for women, minorities, and persons with disabilities?
   a) How would you prioritize these issues or challenges? How did you come to this view?

6. Describe EEO’s role throughout the civilian workforce process (recruiting, selection/hiring, advancement, retention, separation).

**Recruiting and Hiring**

1. What criteria are considered in the development of the agency recruitment plan?
   a) In what ways does the plan consider disabilities, and targeted disabilities in particular?

2. How well do current recruitment sources yield the expected rate of qualified applicants of all racial and national origin groups, and both sexes, who meet organizational needs?

3. In what ways does recruitment literature reflect, or not reflect, the [IC or Agency]’s desire to reach all segments of the potential workforce?

4. Do Agency leaders (seniors, managers) make themselves available to community, civic, and other groups interested in enhancing equal employment opportunity? If yes, how? [Examples: outreach to local schools, cooperative education programs, career information programs, intern programs]

5. Are the selection requirements and procedures for initial hires job-related and consistent with business necessity?
6. Describe the presence of women, minorities, and persons with disabilities within the senior executive ranks of the [IC/Agency].
   a) Describe the presence… within the managerial ranks (GS-13 through GS-15).
   b) What is EEO’s role in selection for management and executive positions?

**Employee Development and Retention (including organizational culture)**

1. Are there formal mentoring programs in place at [Agency]? How effective are these programs in supporting women, minorities, and people with disabilities?

2. How do employees learn about pathways to advancement?

3. Are there work-related events (e.g., offsite meetings, team building) which, because of the type of activity or location, hindered participation by employees with disabilities?

4. What reasonable accommodations have you seen implemented for someone with disabilities? Does this person work in your Directorate/Office?

5. Do supervisors at [Agency] work well with employees of different backgrounds, gender, race, and ethnicity? Please describe examples you have witnessed.

6. Do you believe you are treated respectfully without regard to your race, gender, age, disability status, sexual orientation, or cultural background? How did you come to this belief?

7. Has receiving particular awards become a criterion for selection to developmental opportunities? If so, please describe.
   a) How are the award recipients selected?
   b) Are there written, objective criteria for awards?
   c) Do particular groups receive awards more often than others?

8. Do disciplinary actions affect selection for developmental opportunities and promotion?
   a) How are disciplinary actions determined?
   b) Are there written, objective criteria for assigning disciplinary actions?
   c) Do particular groups receive disciplinary actions more often than others?

9. Describe the work-life balance policies and programs in place at [Agency].
   a) Have these programs made a noticeable change in the composition of the workforce? If so, how?
   b) How many people make use of these programs?
   c) How does [Agency] culture respond to individuals that participate in these programs?

10. How would you change [Agency] to make the environment more welcoming and nurturing for women, minorities, and persons with disabilities?

11. Describe the role of affinity groups in [Agency], and their effectiveness in influencing [Agency] leadership.

12. What training, detail assignments, or other experiences are key to advancement?
   a) Which ones provide competency experience required for advancement to the SES level?
   b) How are candidates for these developmental opportunities identified and selected?
   c) What are the internal selection requirements and procedures for these opportunities? Are these requirements job-related and consistent with business necessity?
d) Were the opportunities provided in the last fiscal year balanced across all parts of the workforce? If not, which group(s) were less utilized than others, and why?

13. Describe the characteristics of individuals who are promoted to the senior executive level.
   a) What training, development, and experiences were most beneficial?
   b) Which were least beneficial?
   c) What role did formal mentoring play in their development?

14. How does [your Agency] ensure that appropriate training and other developmental opportunities are available to employees at all grade levels, including management and executive training, and in all occupational areas, without regard to race, national origin, sex or disability?

**Promotion and Advancement**

1. Under what circumstances does [Agency] recruit external candidates for management, executive, or SES positions?

2. For career-ladder promotions, is there a difference in time with which one or more groups achieve their full grade potential as compared to other groups (i.e., is the time-in-grade longer for a particular group)?

3. Are employees achieving full performance for their occupation at similar rates with others of different race, national origin, sex or disability?

4. How are promotion selection panels composed when they are used? What is EEO’s role in the selection panels?

5. Are internal promotion qualification requirements and procedures job-related and consistent with business necessity?

6. Are there a number of EEO complaints where non-promotion is identified as the issue? If yes, is there an identifiable trend (e.g., particular group, supervisor, or installation)?

**Separation from Government Employment in the IC**

1. What is the workforce distribution of separations, including disability retirement, for the last fiscal year (grade, occupation, installation, race, sex, national origin, disability, EEO participation, etc.)?

2. Are exit interviews conducted at [Agency]? If not, why not? If yes, how does [Agency] use the exit interview data?

3. Were any trends identified as to why people left [Agency]? (e.g., harassment, perceived barriers to advancement, more money, atmosphere of agency, because of particular supervisor, personal reasons)

4. How does [Agency] ensure that separations are conducted fairly and in a non-discriminatory manner?

5. Have reductions-in-force been conducted at [Agency] in [timeframe]? If so, what procedures were used to ensure these reductions were carried out in a non-discriminatory manner?
APPENDIX G: INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY-WIDE AND AGENCY-SPECIFIC REPORTS

Following is a summary of the IC and ODNI-specific documents, EEO/Diversity and Inclusion Reports, Human Capital studies and analyses, and Strategic Plans reviewed for this report.


CSI Agency Workforce Studies: Lessons Learned from the Workforce Development Initiative and the Director’s Advisory Group, June 2014.

Defense Intelligence Agency. Various studies with focus on: Hispanic Representation, Women, and Culture Initiatives.


Federal Bureau of Investigations. DPI Projects: Building a High Performance, Inclusive and Diverse Workforce.

Federal Bureau of Investigations. FBI Hispanic Recruitment, FY15.
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Intelligence Community Climate Survey Report, EEO-specific data, 2014.


*Intelligence Community EEO and Diversity Strategic Plan 2007 – 2012.*


*Intelligence Community EEO and Diversity Enterprise Strategy 2015 – 2020.*

*Intelligence Community Human Capital Vision 2020 and Implementation Plan.*


United States Air Force. *Annual Executive Summary of I&A’s Progress Compared to 15 Diversity Senior Advisor Panel for the Intelligence Community (DSAPIC) Recommendations*. FY14.
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United States. *H.R. 10428: A Bill to Amend Section 102 of the National Security Act of 1947 to Prohibit Certain Activities by the Central Intelligence Agency and to Limit Certain Other Activities by Such Agency.*
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